1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATERIORE OUT IZONA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVA PAIZ AM 8: 21
3	SANDRA K MARKHAM. CLERK
4	STATE OF ARIZONA,)
5	Plaintiff,)
6	vs.) Case No. V1300CR201080049
7	JAMES ARTHUR RAY,)
8	Defendant.)
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
.6	BEFORE THE HONORABLE WARREN R. DARROW
.7	TRIAL DAY TWENTY-EIGHT
_8	APRIL 6, 2011
9	Camp Verde, Arizona
20	
21	
22	ORIGINAL
23	REPORTED BY
24	MINA G. HUNT AZ CR NO. 50619 CA CSR NO. 8335

_			
		1	INDEX
	1	2	- ·· ··
	1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA	3	EXAMINATIONS PAGE
	2 FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI	5	WITNESS THEODORE M. MERCER
	3	3	Direct by Ms. Polk 82
1	4 STATE OF ARIZONA,)	6	Voir dire by Mr. Li 118
	5		Direct continued by Ms. Polk 128
	7 JAMES ARTHUR RAY,)	7	
	B Defendant)	8	EXHIBITS ADMITTED
	9	"	Number Page
	10	9	830, 832, 833 90
	11	١	242-247 107
	12	10	795-797 129 238, 239, 241 139
	13	11	238, 239, 241 139 822, 823, 827 206
	14		229 214
	15 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	12	278 215
	16 BEFORE THE HONORABLE WARREN R. DARROW	40	817-822 225
	17 TRIAL DAY TWENTY-EIGHT	13	825 225 826,828 234
	18 APRIL 6, 2011	14	829 235
	19 Camp Verde, Arızona		
	20	15	
	21	16	
	22	18	
	23 REPORTED BY	19	
	24 MINA G HUNT AZ CR NO. 50619	20	
]	25 CA CSR NO 8335	21	
		22 23	
		24	
		25	
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:		4
		1	Proceedings had before the Honorable
2	For the Plaintiff:	2	WARREN R. DARROW, Judge, taken on Wednesday,
3	YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE	3	April 6, 2011, at Yavapai County Superior Court,
4	BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY	4	Division Pro Tem B, 2840 North Commonwealth Drive,
~	255 East Gurley		
5	Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868	5	Camp Verde, Arizona, before Mina G. Hunt, Certified
6		6	Reporter within and for the State of Arizona.
	For the Defendant:	7	
7	THOMAS K. KELLY, PC	8	
8	BY. THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY	9	
9	425 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001	10	
		11	
10	MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY· LUIS LI, ATTORNEY	12	
11	BY TRUC DO, ATTORNEY	13	
12	355 South Grand Avenue		
	Los Angeles, California 90071-1560	14	
13		15	
14	MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY. MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY	16	
1	560 Mission Street	17	
15	San Francisco, California 94105-2907	18	
16		19	
17		20	
18		21	
19		1	
20		22	I I

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

6

7

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: We're on the record in State versus James Arthur Ray, who is present with his attorneys, Mr. Li, Mr. Kelly and Ms. Do. The state is represented by Ms. Polk and Mr. Hughes.

The attorneys have requested time to discuss legal issues. And I appreciate you emailed me with a very brief summary of what would be discussed.

I guess, Mr. Li.

MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor. There is, essentially, two issues that's outlined in the email. One is the issue about whether or not the state's avowal that the sweat lodges were, essentially, the same structure is correct or borne out by the facts, and the other relates to the Court's prior 404(b) ruling.

With respect to the first issue, I think it's important to note that a sweat lodge is, essentially, made of only a few components. One is the frame. The other is the coverings. Other components would be rocks and then the wood used to heat the rocks. That's essentially the entire universe of, quote, unquote, materials used in the sweat lodge ceremony.

Now, we talked to Mr. Mercer yesterday to explore the foundation -- any foundation that he 2 3 might have if he were proffered by the state to be 4 able to testify that, in fact, the sweat lodge used 5 in October '09 is the same sweat lodge that was used in May '09, which is the subject of, I think, Ms. Foster's testimony.

8 THE COURT: Perhaps. She was not clear on the 9 date.

MR. LI: It could have also been earlier. But

11 even if it were only the May sweat lodge, what we -- what we explored with Mr. Mercer is 12 what's the basis for his foundation -- you know --13 14 his -- any claim that he would know that these are 15 the same -- this is the same material. And what we 16 found out is that, in fact, it isn't.

Not only are many of the materials entirely different, but he cannot say and would be guessing if -- he cannot say that even the tarps were the same. And he would say that he was guessing if he got up there and said that the tarps were the same.

23 And the reason is he says that all the 24 tarps look the same. They're all just blue tarps, and there's no way to tell them apart. He did say blankets -- where he could tell the difference

3 between them because maybe they were sewn together.

7

8

4 But there were many moving blankets that 5 were just simply moving blankets. And he cannot

6 tell whether one moving blanket is the same as a

7 prior moving blanket. They're not numbered.

There's no inventory. All those sorts of issues

impact his ability to -- you know -- establish that

10 these are, in fact, even the same coverings.

And the pertinent fact is this:

12 Mr. Hamilton hired Ted Mercer to work for Angel

13 Valley in 2008. At the end of 2008, they separated

ways. And, essentially, Mr. Mercer through all

15 of 2009 was not an employee of Angel Valley. He

16 worked exactly two days for Angel Valley. One day

17 is when he put up a sweat lodge in May of 2009 and

another day when he put up the sweat lodge in

19 October 2009.

11

20 And, Your Honor, we prepared a 21 transcript -- and I know I had sent it back

22 earlier. We have provided a copy to the state.

23 This is a transcript of our interview with

24 Mr. Mercer yesterday. I would like to provide it

25 to the Court.

THE COURT: That's not what I had requested. 1

I had asked for some medical records.

3 MR. LI: I understand.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LI: In terms of -- in terms of the

6 proffer that I'm making here, I would like -- I

provided a copy to the state. It's the state's

8 recording that we had transcribed last night.

9

If I may approach?

10 THE COURT: Okay. You may. Has that been

11 marked?

5

12

MR. LI: It has not.

13 THE COURT: Then it needs to be marked. There

needs to be a very special record on this. I don't 14

15 want there to be any confusion. If it gets marked,

16 it doesn't mean it's an exhibit in the case. It

17 needs to be kept separate. There was one other

18 time when it came up with possible confusion. I

19 think it was in the 609 context of having things

20 come in. And I don't want nonexhibits going to the

21 jury.

22 MR. LI: Sure.

THE COURT: So I'd like that marked.

24 Ms. Polk, I want to see that just for

25 purposes of this discussion.

- 1 MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor.
- 2 THE COURT: Okay.

4

5

17

18

25

- 3 MR. LI: Should I hand it to the Court first?
 - THE COURT: To the clerk. Please.

MR. LI: And so the remaining 270 some-odd

6 days, Mr. Mercer was not on the property, was

7 not -- had no employee responsibilities at the

- The mad no employee responsibilities at the
- 8 property in 2009. So, essentially, he worked two
- **9** days. The remaining 270 days he had nothing to do
- 10 with Angel Valley. So he has no idea and no
- 11 foundation to speak of what sort of maintenance is
- 12 going on, what's happening in the pump house, what
- 13 they're even doing at Angel Valley, what they're
- 14 doing with the tarps, what they're doing with the
- 15 wood, what they're doing with any of the lands, any
- 16 of those things.

I just want to make a few specific points, Your Honor, relating to the various

- 19 components. With respect to the wood, it is -- it
- 20 is by definition not the same wood. Because -- and
- 21 this should be obvious. But when you burn the
- 22 wood, it turns to ash. And so, obviously, there's
- 23 no way it can be, in fact, the exact same wood.
- 24 That's a fact that Mr. Mercer agreed with.
 - It is also not even the same type of

ad NA/bila in moinin aireat la dana at la att

- wood. While in prior sweat lodges, at least in one
- 2 prior sweat lodge, some construction wood was used.
- 3 In the October 2009 sweat lodge, almost all of it
- 4 was construction wood. And that's what Mr. Mercer
- 5 said in two different interviews with the Yavapai
- 6 County Sheriff and yesterday.
- 7 So, one, it is absolutely, in fact, not
- 8 the same wood. Because obviously when you burn
- 9 wood, it turns to ash; you cannot burn it again.
- 10 And the second point is that it's not even the same
- 11 types of wood.
- With respect to the rocks, Mr. Mercer
- 13 explicitly said that these are not the same rocks.
- 14 It's not even that -- they always use different
- 15 rocks. Now, they may be the same type of rock;
- 16 that is, lava rock obtained from the creek. But
- 17 they are not the same rocks. And he cannot say
- The they are not the same rocks. And he cannot say
- 18 that he knows whether anything happened to the
- 19 rocks, whether they were treated with anything,
- 20 whether any sort of additive was put on the rock by
- 21 accident, on purpose, anything. He has no idea.
- 22 But they are not, in fact, the same rocks,
- 23 explicitly.
- 24 With respect to the tarps, I already
- 25 addressed that. Essentially, what he can say is --

- 1 Your Honor, there's a big brown -- you know --
- 2 rubber tarp gasket that Mr. Hamilton made for the
- 3 sweat lodge. That he can say is the same. Okay?
- 4 And in the pictures, the Court has probably seen
 - it. It's a big -- it's the main covering.

6 Inside that covering are blankets,

7 sleeping bags and moving blankets and -- you

- 8 know -- those blue sort of utility tarps. He
- 9 cannot say that any of the utility tarps are the
- 10 same. He has no idea because they all look the
- **11** same.

12 In fact, he has said that these tarps are

- 13 all over Angel Valley -- found all over Angel
- 14 Valley, used for all different purposes. He has no
- 15 idea whether the tarps that are in the pump house
- **16** are the same tarps that he looked at earlier. In
- 17 fact, when he went in there, he seen new bags of
- 18 tarps, brand-new tarps in there. So he has no idea
- 19 whether people are putting things in there, taking
- 20 them out, using them for other reasons. He has no
- **21** idea.
- 22 With respect to the blankets, there are a
- 23 few blankets he can tell are the same because
- 24 perhaps they've been sewn together or are in some
- 25 distinctive manner identifiable. But the rest of

10

- them he has no clue. He says a moving blanket
- looks like a moving blanket. And so he doesn't
- 3 know whether they're the same blankets or they're
- 4 different blankets.

5

Another point with relation to these

- 6 tarps, he has no idea for the 270 some-odd days
- 7 when he's not on property, whether any of these
- 8 tarps, blankets, whatever have been taken out of
- 9 the pump house and used for any other purpose,
- 10 because he can't -- he has no foundation, no
- 11 personal knowledge relating to that.

On top of that, he says that the tarps

- are not assembled in any particular order. There'sno -- you know -- it's not like they're numbered
- 15 and that each tarp goes in its -- you know --
- **16** prescribed place, that they're just put on there in
- 17 a random pattern.

So he can't say that they're the same

- 19 tarps. He can't say that they were maintained in
- 20 exactly the same way. He can't describe in any way
- 21 how they were maintained. He can't even say that
- 22 they stayed in the pump house for 270 some-odd
- 23 days. And he can't say that they were assembled --
 - 4 in fact, he can say that they were not assembled in
- 25 the -- in the same manner.

19

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to the rat poison that he 1 2 identified in October -- on October 9 to Detective Diskin, he says he doesn't know how it got there. He says he saw it on the floor, chunks of it. And he has no personal knowledge how they 6 got -- how the rat poison got in there.

He also said that he has no personal knowledge as to whether anybody put rat poison in the tarps themselves. So he cannot -- you know -identify when the rat poison was put there, if any additional rat poison was put there. He has no idea, other than the two days he was in the pump house, what happened on the other 270 days.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Same thing with the prospective insecticide. He doesn't know whether for those 270 some-odd days anybody treated any of those tarps with insecticides. He has no personal knowledge to any of that, so he cannot say that these tarps, even the ones that are the same that he can identify, are in the same condition each time he's looked at them. He simply cannot say that.

22 With respect to the land under which 23 the -- you know -- the frame -- on top of which the 24 frame sets and the coverings are placed, he's not 25 the landscaper. He was on the property a couple of

days; doesn't know what happened on the other 270

2 days; doesn't know if the land was treated in any particular way; doesn't know whether there was any 3

herbicide, pesticide, anything like that used.

4 5 He will say that he believes that the

Hamiltons had a policy against using pesticides. Okay? He will say that. That's a belief. But he also would admit that he has no idea whether, A, somebody else just put pesticides not knowing of the policy; or, B, whether the Hamiltons themselves

10 11 followed their policy. 12

And I would -- I would submit, Your Honor, that Fawn Foster's testimony relating to both rat poison and ant poison suggests that whatever policy the Hamiltons had was perhaps observed in the breach. Because clearly those things -- rat poison and ant poison -- would, I think, qualify as pesticides and chemicals that would -- you know -- purported to be in violation

of this purported policy.

The bottom line with respect to Mr. Mercer is he cannot establish foundation at all that the sweat lodges in October 2009 or any prior sweat lodge, but in particular May 2009, but even any prior sweat lodge before that, is the same

sweat lodge with the same materials stored in the same manner.

He has no ability to testify about the

15

16

hundreds and hundreds of days between when he 4 actually touched the various material. He doesn't 6 know how any of these things were treated. He has 7 a belief, but he does not know. And he admitted it

in the transcript that I've provided to the Court.

9 So with that -- with that, that's the 10 first issue which has to do with whether or not Mr. Mercer should be permitted to testify without 11 12 any foundation about whether or not he knows that 13 the sweat lodge in October 2009 is the same as the 14 sweat lodge in May 2009 or any prior sweat lodge.

15 And we'd submit to the Court, Your Honor, 16 that there is literally no foundation for any of 17 that. He literally doesn't know anything other 18 than some of the tarps are the same.

THE COURT: Ms. Polk.

20 MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 First of all, the issues that Mr. Li is 22 addressing goes to the weight of the evidence, not

23 the admissibility. And I would also submit that

24 his recitation of what Mr. Mercer's testimony will

be is somewhat exaggerated. And his last statement

that Mr. Mercer literally can lay no foundation is simply not true.

3 But what he's attacking -- what Mr. Li is attacking goes to the weight of the information, not the admissibility. The issue is whether or not 5 information concerning what happened in prior years 7 at Angel Valley in other sweat lodges or in 8 identical or similar sweat lodges is relevant.

And I would point, first of all, to Rule 401, that defines "relevant evidence" as any evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.

There's no requirement that these sweat lodge materials -- the rocks, the water, the fire -- there's no requirement that everything be identical in order to make this topic relevant. And the reason this topic is relevant is because the defense has challenged causation.

They are challenging that it is heat that killed the three victims. They are suggesting that it's something other than heat, such as chemicals on the property in the form of insecticides, something sprayed here or there or perhaps in the

tarps themselves. So the defendant is charging 2 causation.

3 Relevant to causation, then, is this 4 information that relates to sweat lodges run at Angel Valley in the preceding years. And there's 6 actually three patterns that are relevant. The 7 first is that if it's the defendant running the sweat lodge, then people get sick. It doesn't 9 matter what the kiva is made of. It doesn't matter 10 what the coverings were made of. What matters --11 the common denominator is if it's the defendant 12 running the sweat lodge, then people get sick.

During that time frame from 2005 through 2009, there are many other sweat lodges that are conducted on the property of Angel Valley. And testimony will be that people don't get sick.

So the first pattern is regardless of the kiva, regardless of the tops and the coverings and the wood and the water and the rocks, if the defendant runs it, then people get sick. That's what's identical.

22 The second pattern is that from May of 2008 forward -- actually, I think it's August 23 of 2008 forward, when the kiva was built that was 24 25 used in 2008, the latter part of 2008 and 2009,

18

that the ceremonies that are conducted in that kiva

2 and coverings, which are, essentially, the same,

3 the pattern again is that if it's the defendant

running the sweat lodge, people get sick. And if

it's somebody else running it, people don't get 5

6 sick.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

So the first pattern is it doesn't matter what the kıva ıs made of or what the covering is made of. The common denominator is the defendant.

The second pattern is when it's, essentially, the same covering, it is the same kiva, the common denominator again is the defendant. If he's running it, people get sick. If other people are facilitating the sweat lodge, people don't get sick.

And then the third pattern is this pattern of the defendant and heat. And what the testimony will be through various witnesses is that in '03 and '04 the sweat lodge was not hot enough for the defendant and he asked for more and more heat.

22 In '05 the Hamiltons created this large 23 rubber membrane that goes over the sweat lodge. They added that, and then that's the year that 24 people got sick, including Daniel Pfankuch. And 25

I'll talk about his records in a moment.

2 After the '05 incident the testimony at the 404(b) hearing through Amayra Hamilton was that

4 9-1-1 was called. An ambulance came. She

5 confronted Mr. Ray. She told them this will never

happen again on my property. He apologized. And

7 then in '04 he ratchets down the heat -- I'm sorry.

In '06. And then by '07 the testimony at the

404(b) hearing was he wanted it hotter again. And

10 so '07 people get sick.

11

13

14

15

24

25

And then by 2008, that's when the new 12 kiva was built and the same coverings are put on the structure. '07 people get sick. '08 people get even sicker. And then in 2009 three people die.

16 There's three different patterns that are 17 relevant to this issue of causation. The common 18 denominator through all those patterns, the thing 19 that's identical, is the defendant. It's not relevant to two of those three patterns what the 20 21 kiva was made of or what the structure was. The 22 information is relevant because it goes to this 23 issue of causation.

It's through the three patterns that there is information that leads the jury to

conclude that it's the heat that kills and not some

other substance on the property, some other

3 pesticide.

4 Your Honor, the -- I just want to discuss 5 the interview with Ted Mercer yesterday. The state

was given a transcript this morning. And I was

there for the interview with Mr. Mercer. And on

page 8, lines 13 through 28, Mr. Li says to

Mr. Mercer, okay. And you have no idea whether

10 these coverings, other than the big sort of round

11 one, are exactly the same as all the other sweat

12 lodge ceremonies?

13 And Mr. Mercer says, oh. Sure they're

14 the same. 15

And Mr. Li says, but you don't know that 16 because they're not numbered, are they?

Mr. Mercer says: Well, I know that because I'm the one that put them away and I'm the one that went and got them. So I -- in between the time no one else would go in there. I mean, every once in a while there might be new ones that would show up in the package.

23 And then on page 11, when Mr. Li is then doing what he can rightly do in front of the jury, 25 which is attempt to impeach or pick away at the

5 of 71 sheets

17

18

20

21

weight of the evidence, Mr. Li says, the only 1 person who would know would be Michael Hamilton? 2 And Mr. Mercer agrees with that.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then if I can direct the Court's attention to Exhibit 661, which is the transcript of the interview of Michael and Amayra Hamilton on October 26 of 2009 by the detective. On page 5, lines 23 through 28, Detective Poling says, so the 2009 lodge is different than the 2008?

And Mr. Hamilton says, 2008 and 2009 were exactly the same materials, exactly the same physical structure.

And then if I can direct the Court to the testimony of Amayra Hamilton at the 404(b) hearing where that same issue is addressed. And it's page 15. And that's where the pattern -- I think the Court will recall where Mrs. Hamilton testified to the pattern of the defendant wanting more heat over the years, and when the heat was increased, people got sick. After 2005, the heat was decreased. People didn't get sick for a couple of years. And then at Mr. Ray's request, the heat was increased again.

And then on -- and then at page 36 there's a discussion of what materials are used to

build the kiva and the coverings and then how they are stored.

3 Again, Your Honor, this information goes to the weight, not the admissibility. And the 4 admissibility is clear. It is clear that the 5 6 defendant has raised the issue of causation. It is 7 clear that he is claiming that it's not the heat 8 that killed the three victims, that it's something 9 else on the property. And most relevant, very 10 relevant, to whether or not it's the heat or 11 something else are those three patterns that I have 12 identified that show that it's the pattern of heat 13 with the common denominator being Mr. Ray.

will be is that in 2008 a new kiva was built. He personally builds it. He will testify that in his experience at Angel Valley from 2007 through 2009, it's all the same blankets and it's all the same tarps, although new tarps might be added. And it's

that same membrane that goes over the top.

exactly the same coverings.

What the testimony through Mr. Mercer

Mr. Mercer will talk about how the coverings are stored in the pump house. That's where he gets them from. That's where he puts them back. And then Mr. Hamilton will testify that it's

There is no requirement, Your Honor, that the state show that exactly the same materials are

used to build the coverings or that it's exactly

4 the same wood or the same water. That just goes to

5 the weight.

6

7

9

10

Mr. Mercer will testify about heat, how he constructs the sweat lodge every time he puts the coverings on the kiva and that there is a general order. He will testify that the blankets and the sleeping bags, that multiple layers of those go first. Then there's a layer of tarps,

12 that no tarps are on the inside, and that over the 13 top goes the membrane.

14 So, essentially, there's a pattern. But there's no requirement that the blankets be 15 16 numbered, that they go in any certain order. He'll 17 talk about the general order. And then through Detective Diskin, they took a sample of the 18 19 material and left it in place. And so the jury 20 will be able to see the layers of blankets, the 21 layer of tarp, and then the membrane over the top. 22

Your Honor, the state submits that this 23 information is clearly relevant to causation.

24 And then with respect to the 2005

25 incident and the medical records of Daniel

Pfankuch, who is the patient who was taken to the

hospital in 2005, the -- his admitting diagnosis

was syncope, which is fainting. The notes indicate

syncope, and the word "heat," and it looks like

"exposure"; although that might -- we'll leave it 5

to the doctor to interpret that for us. The

patient was discharged with instructions for heat

exhaustion.

8

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

9 And then the information that was noted 10 on his intake is that he was aggressive, that he 11 had a rapid -- a racing pulse, that his eyes were 12 rolled back in the back of his head, and that he 13 was unresponsive.

Those, of course, are all very similar --15 those are all symptoms of heat stroke. We've had that testimony through the doctors now and opposing -- those are very similar to what we've heard happened in 2009 with respect to Stephen Ray and to many of our other participants as well. And, Your Honor, part of that was the ambulance report that I was looking at.

But, finally, Your Honor, the state submits that the information that goes to causation is relevant. And a proper foundation will be laid through Mr. Mercer today, and then it will be

bolstered through the testimony of the Hamiltons later this week. 2

3 THE COURT: Mr. Li, did you have anything 4 else?

MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor. You know, this is a critical moment in the trial, because this -- this is sort of the intersection of a lot of the legal issues we've been fighting over for the last six months or so. And I had not addressed the 404(b) issue because I thought we were only going to focus on -- on whether or not Mr. Mercer had any foundation.

13 THE COURT: I think it's very closely related. 14 MR. LI: Yes. And I had not -- I had not 15 discussed that yet because I think as -- the first 16 issue, we have to discuss Mr. Mercer's foundation or lack thereof. 17

Ms. Polk is incorrect. The evidence code does not say you can admit information for which a witness lacks personal knowledge. That's Rule 602. And I'll just read it.

22 A witness may not testify to a matter unless the evidence --23

24 THE COURT: I know the Rule.

25 MR. LI: Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

26

THE COURT: I mentioned it.

MR. LI: And so it's not a question of weight. It's a question of admissibility.

4 Essentially, this witness doesn't know --5 you know -- how these materials were stored, 6 whether they're even the same materials. He 7 doesn't know -- he knows for a fact they're not the 8 same rocks. He knows for a fact they're not the

You know. And the -- and the thing that is very disturbing for counsel here is that when the state -- you know -- selectively reads from the transcript this portion where Mr. Mercer said, yeah. I did know because I'm the one that put them

14 away, well -- you know -- what happens next is we 15

16 sit down and we say, well, Mr. Mercer. Let's talk 17

about your foundation for that.

same -- not the same wood.

And it -- you know -- I've highlighted 18 page 9, which the Court -- I mean, which the state 19 decided not to read. And it says -- I mean, I'm 20 not going to read it to you. But it's all there, 21 Your Honor. It says, so -- you know -- you know --

22 23 So even though you're saying that because you're

24 the one who puts the tarps on and off, there could

have been someone that came in here and took some

out and brought some other ones in. So you don't

know, for instance, whether or not every single

tarp was exactly the same tarp because you don't

4 have an inventory with the traps?

That's correct.

6 I mean, they're just tarps?

7 Yes.

5

8 So the point is that this -- this is a pattern that we see where the state will ask some

10 witness, do you know whether -- some fact. You

know, some inflammatory fact. The witness will say 11

12 Yes. And then instead of asking the next question,

13 which is a proper question -- how do you know? Or

did you personally observe this? Or any of the

15 sort of basic foundational questions, they just run

16 right into it.

17 And the problem with this, this exact 18 issue with Mr. Mercer, he, in fact, does not have 19 foundation. If the Court reads the transcript, the 20 Court will see that over and over again, Mr. Mercer 21 says things like I would be guessing. I was not on 22 the property for 200 some-odd days. I have no idea

23 what was going on in the pump house. I have no 24

idea.

25

11

He doesn't know what's actually in there.

So the basic foundational point that the sweat

lodges are the same is -- fails. And it's not a

weight issue. It's an admissibility issue.

4 Because he simply has no personal knowledge. And

under 602 it would be precluded.

6 With respect to the 404(b) issue, now it just becomes this argument the state has made that

it's a pattern. I wrote it down. That the

defendant runs sweat lodges in the same way, and

10 they get sick. So it's a pattern.

That is exactly propensity evidence.

12 Assuming for a second we even knew what the state's

theory of action is, what actually happened -- you 13

know. What is it that Mr. Ray did that is a crime

15 in 2009? Assuming that they ever have stated that

16 properly, which we would submit they haven't. But

17 assume for a second that they did. What they are

18 saying is that he did things in 2005, 2006, 2007,

19 2008, and the same thing happened in 2009. And,

20 therefore, because he did prior acts that were

21 consistent and in conformity therewith in 2009, the

22 jury should be able to conclude that based on the

23 purported facts, Mr. Ray -- you know -- is guilty

of manslaughter in 2009. That's exactly what Rule

404(b) prohibits.

1 It has some narrow exceptions, which the 2 Court has already ruled on, relating to knowledge, motive, intent, all of those sorts of things. Propensity, i.e., pattern evidence, is explicitly disallowed by Rule 404(b). It's explicitly 6 disallowed.

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

here.

And so what the state is, essentially, 8 inviting the Court to do is inviting error. The 9 state is, essentially, saying never mind Rule 602, which deals with lack of personal knowledge and the 10 11 inadmissibility of information for which a witness 12 has no personal knowledge. Never mind that. Never 13 mind the Court's very carefully worded ruling in 14 February relating to the 404(b) hearing that we had 15 where we had three days of witnesses, including all of the same witnesses that the state now wants to 16 17 reintroduce for exactly the same purpose.

The Court heard each of those witnesses that the state is now saying, well, these are the witnesses that are going to show the pattern. The Court spent three days with these witnesses, and the Court ruled --THE COURT: I've got my ruling open right

MR. LI: Okay. I just think --

THE COURT: I mean, the actual court ruling that I actually ordered?

3 MR. LI: Yeah. I'm not going to read it.

4 THE COURT: It's important, though. I certainly want to bring that up because it's really 5 6 quite focused.

7 But go ahead. Please say what you want to say, Mr. Lı. 8

9 MR. LI: Well, I mean, it just says right 10 here, the Court has concluded, on page 3, that the 11 evidence presented in this -- this is stated in

12 different ways. This is a very full paragraph. 13

THE COURT: Again if you're going to read, 14 please at a pace.

MR. LI: I apologize.

The Court has concluded that the evidence presented in this 404(b) proceeding does not establish that the harm manifested by the signs and symptoms associated with some pre-2009 sweat lodge participants was similar for purposes of 404(b) analysis to the life-threatening and fatal conditions suffered by some participants in 2009.

Assuming that the defendant was aware of the various signs and symptoms associated with

pre-2009 participants -- which I think the Court 25

also ruled there was no evidence of that -- this knowledge would not constitute notice that he

3 allegedly was subjecting these participants to a

4 substantial and unjustifiable risk of death.

5 As noted above, despite the large number 6 of participants, there is no substantial medical 7 evidence that any of the persons attending the 8 pre-2009 Spiritual Warrior events suffered a

9 life-threatening condition. Therefore, with regard 10 to the manslaughter charges, evidence of the

11 similarity of the way in which the sweat lodge and

12 other ceremonies were conducted from year to year

13 is not relevant and admissible on the issues of

14 knowledge, i.e., conscious disregard to the known 15 risk and absence of mistake or accident.

So that's -- that's the Court's ruling on exactly the topic that the state is now trying to relitigate, this exact same issue that we spent days arguing in court, briefing, where the Court wrote a very detailed and well-reasoned opinion.

And now we're going to just, based on a 22 complete lack of foundation, open the door -according to the state, we're going to open the door and reverse the ruling that the Court made in

25 February 2011.

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

1

10

11

30

And the problem with that, Your Honor, is that it's not proper. The problem with that is

3 that we have designed our entire case and have

spent, what, eight weeks in trial right now with

5 this ruling as something that we understood to be

6 some of the ground rules. 7

The state has continually tried to erode 8 the ruling any way they can. And the latest one is causation. And so they say, well, look. All these sweat lodges are the same every single time. And that the only difference between the instances 12 where somebody gets sick and instances where

13 nothing happens is Mr. Ray. And so because the

sweat lodges are the same, we can throw out the 14

15 idea that there's some environmental problem or

16 there might have been some environmental problem in

17 October 2009 because the sweat lodges are the same.

18 And it's all Mr. Ray's fault because there's this 19 pattern.

20 That's their argument now. And that's 21 sort of now become a causation argument. Okay?

The problem with that entire theory is that it lacks any foundation and is completely inadmissible under Rule 602. Mr. Mercer does not know. He says -- you can read the transcript. He

22

23

says, I'd be guessing. Because, of course, hedoesn't know.

3

4

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

25

1

2

He's not -- he's not the guy. There's no bar code on any of this stuff, and he's not the guy who's in charge of the pump house. He's there two days in the entire year of 2009. He doesn't work there. He has no idea what's going on.

And so Ms. Polk's argument that now, well, that -- we don't have to worry about that.

He can just get up there and say whatever he wants and it's really for the jury to decide whether --

and it's really for the jury to decide whether -you know -- the weight of the evidence as opposed
to the admissibility -- that's not how it works.

First, this witness has to have some foundation. He's, essentially, just offering an opinion. He doesn't have personal knowledge. He's not an expert. And under 602 all of that should be stricken.

As a consequence, the consequence, the only argument remaining to the state is that, well,
Mr. Ray ran a sweat lodge in ways that the state contends were dangerous and produced these -- what the state contends were life-threatening conditions.

But what the Court has heard in our

34 hearings and seen pictures, Your Honor -- and I'm

3 THE COURT: No. That's okay.

sorry to be so long-winded.

4 MR. LI: But this is -- this is obviously a 5 critical moment in the case.

The state saw witness after witness after witness under oath here at the 404(b) hearing. The

8 state saw the very same witnesses we're talking

9 about here right now -- Ted Mercer and Debbie

10 Mercer -- talk about how they saw 20 people in

11 life-threatening conditions after the 2008 sweat

12 lodges. And then the Court saw those pictures that

13 we showed one after another of people like this and

14 people smiling, people identified by the witnesses

15 as having been in a life-threatening condition in

16 one picture, and then in the very next picture

17 they're lying -- leaning up with a big thumbs up

18 and a big grin on their face.

And the point the Court saw and upon which the Court based its ruling was that that's just not -- that's improper lay opinion that is, frankly, wrong.

And as the Court said, it would be misleading to the jury, deeply misleading to the

25 jury, to suggest that based on that flimsy type of

evidence, that life-threatening conditions occurred

2 in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008. It simply didn't

3 happen. And the Court ruled that way in that

4 paragraph that I read.

5 So to now allow I think -- six months or

6 so after we have this hearing, after we saw all

7 those photographs, to allow -- you know -- two

3 months after the Court made a very well-reasoned

9 ruling about exactly these issues, to now just

10 allow the state to willy-nilly bring in new

11 information or new arguments and then bring in

12 old -- the prior sweat lodge, contrary to the

13 Court's opinion, when we have relied on this, when

14 we have gone through this entire trial, given our

15 opening statements, directed our various

16 cross-examinations, all of those things; on that

17 basis it would be wrong, and it would be unfair,

18 Your Honor, and contrary to the law.

19 THE COURT: Were there other legal issues you

20 were going to raise?

1

2

21 Ms. Polk, you mentioned something about

22 the Hamiltons' testimony?

23 MS. POLK: Your honor, I have a few

24 miscellaneous with respect to the Hamiltons'

testimony. Do you want me to raise them right now?

36

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. POLK: Just a few things, Your Honor.

3 First of all, the Court had referenced a

f 4 couple of days ago the issue of bankruptcy. And f I

5 believe I heard the Court saying that there would

6 be no information concerning the Hamiltons'

7 bankruptcy in the trial?

8 THE COURT: I just -- the only thing I wanted

9 to do is make sure in order -- 2.9 requires if I

10 hear something factual, I need to let --

11 inadvertently, I need to let the parties know. I

12 have no idea about any reliability, if that has any

13 accuracy to it whatsoever. And that's all I said.

14 I just mentioned it because someone unsolicited

 $oldsymbol{5}$ mentioned something to that effect to me, and $oldsymbol{I}$

16 wanted the parties to know.

MS. POLK: And I don't know from the defense whether or not they intend to raise that. I guess I would wait to hear from them whether or not they believe that the bankruptcy is relevant.

21 THE COURT: So is that a fact, then?

22 MS. POLK: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

24 MS. POLK: I believe that they are. I

actually believe that they are. I don't know too

19

20

21

22

17

18

19

20

```
1
   much about it.
```

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

21

22

23

24

25

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 Mr. Kelly.

believe I'm going to conduct the questioning of 6 Mr. Hamilton. And I was going to raise that issue, 7 Judge. I believe it relates to his motive and 8

MR. KELLY: Judge, if I may address that. I

bias -- potential motive and bias. That's why he's 9 trying to save his failing company.

10 THE COURT: Okay. When would it be anticipated that the Hamiltons would testify? 11 12 Possibly today?

13 MS. POLK: No. It will be the Mercers first 14 and then the Hamiltons later in the week.

THE COURT: Then rather than have full argument, can we do what we're doing now so I can at least be tuned in to what might come up? Because I really want to get going with things today. But what other issues just so I'll know and can look ahead a bit?

MS. POLK: There is a memorandum. It was an email that we received from Mrs. Hamilton. We disclosed everything we received to the defense.

24 In it she stated her belief that there was a

romantic relationship going on between Kirby Brown

and James Shore.

2 There is no evidence to support that. We 3 do not believe it to be true at all. The two had 4 not even met before the Spiritual Warrior week. 5 But that was another area that it would be unfair and prejudicial for the defense to raise it. There 6 7 is no good basis to raise it.

THE COURT: Okav.

8 9 MS. POLK: In one of the interviews there is a 10 question posed that -- about whether or not Michael 11 Hamilton has a reputation for being violent or for 12 not treating employees well. Again, there is no 13 information to substantiate that. That would be 14 character evidence that would be inadmissible. 15 But, again, those are the types of questions 16 through cross-examination where the damage is done 17 in the question.

18 And so the state would ask that the defense not be allowed to even pose a question 19 20 along those lines.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. POLK: And the final area is the area of the lawsuits. I believe it's 10 plaintiffs had filed claims against the defendant and lawsuits against the Hamiltons. That's still pending. I

believe that, consistent with the Court's prior

rulings, that it is admissible on the issue of bias

of a witness. But to inquire any further about

specific allegations made in this lawsuit, again,

we are looking at statements made by plaintiffs.

6 And for the defense to start reading 7 through the lawsuit and suggesting that specific allegations are true is going beyond the rule that allows the lawsuit to be used to question motive or

10 bias of a witness.

11 And so I would ask that the 12 information -- the fact that there's a lawsuit, I 13 believe that that is relevant but that it would not 14 be appropriate to start reading from the complaint 15 itself, as has been the practice for past 16 witnesses. 17

Additionally, there was a lawsuit filed 18 against the Hamiltons and/or Angel Valley by Native 19 Americans. That has been dismissed. And I do not believe that that should be raised at all in this 20 21 case.

22 And then, finally, there is a lawsuit between the Hamiltons -- filed by the Hamiltons and 23 24 Angel Valley against Mr. Ray, which is still

pending.

40

1 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly, all I need to know at this point, do you oppose all the positions of the state on these various issues? Is there anything that you agree on?

5 MR. KELLY: I would agree, Judge, with an explanation as to the relationship, if any, between Kirby and James -- or between Ms. Brown and Mr. Shore. We were not intending on bringing that up. But I do want to point out to the Court that

there are witnesses, I believe, who testified they 10

11 were holding hands and kind of an implication that one was staying in to protect or help the other.

13 But we don't intend to explore a relationship, if

any. It's simply -- I can't see any relevance. 14

15 In regards to these other areas, Judge, I 16 would simply state that if we have a good-faith basis to ask a question relating to motive or bias 18 of a witness, we intend to ask that question. And 19 that would include representations made in

20 lawsuits, whether as a plaintiff or a defendant.

21 And I believe it is -- we've been through this.

22 But we would always, of course, Judge, have a

good-faith basis. If asked to prove it up, we'll 23

24 prove it up.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

become relevant, because they have made relevant

On March 1st the Court correctly noted

victims. I'm sorry. But that's why it's now

the issue of causation.

1 MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may, just one quick 2 point. As my colleague showed me the transcript of the arguments from November of this year when we were talking about exactly this issue relating to -- you know -- propensity evidence, and Ms. Polk, essentially, makes the exact same 6 7 argument relating to why these prior sweat lodges are admissible, as she just has made today. Which 8 9 is, essentially -- you know -- what makes this tragic -- what separates what happened in 2009, 10 what distinguishes it from a tragic accident and 12 makes it a crime? The answer is the state of 13 recklessness.

Having gone through the lodges -- sweat lodges in 2005, 2007, 2008, having had -- being made aware of what happens to people when you expose them to extreme heat, aware of that risk, and chooses to consciously disregard and then conduct a sweat lodge in 2009 that is even hotter, more intense, puts more pressure on the participants to stay inside, that's what makes it a crime. That's what shows he acted recklessly. So the point is, it's the same song, just a different day. And we've litigated this issue extensively. We had a long -- a lot of argument

22 What does "causation" mean? It means 23

25

about this. And the Court made a very well-founded ruling, and we'd urge the Court to stick to that

3 rulina. 4 THE COURT: Part of the ruling was based on --

excuse me. Well, Ms. Polk, if you want to address 5 6 that last point.

MS. POLK: I do want to, Your Honor. Because it was at the 404(b) hearing that what the state was addressing was admissibility of this information under Rule 404(b) to show the absence of mistake in some of the other arguments that we made.

The Court's ruling was clear that you were not addressing causation. This is not the same dance or the same song on another day. We have respected that ruling, and we are not reurging reconsideration of the Court's ruling under 404(b).

But in the Court's ruling, the Court was clear that the information was not admissible on the basis that it was similar or to show the absence of mistake or accident. That is not why we are addressing it here today.

23 And at the 404(b) hearing the defense never argued the issue of causation. They never argued that some other -- something other than heat 25

that the 404(b) hearing was limited to -- that you were not reconsidering the 404(b) but that your consideration of the evidence was under the 404(b) factors. And on that date the Court noted that it

10 would be relevant to the issue of causation. 11 And then again on the date that Jennifer 12 Haley testified, which was March 9, the Court again discussed that information about what happened on

previous events was relevant to the issue of

15 causation.

41

4

5

7

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

42

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I just -- there's just a couple of things. One is it's the state's burden to explain why its particular evidence is relevant. We noticed causation back in March of 2010 as a potential defense.

causation. And if the state wants to introduce evidence to rebut our defense about causation, they've got to file motions and explain why

particular pieces of evidence are relevant, particularly when we're talking into an area

relating to 404(b), where the general rule, Your

Honor, is to preclude the evidence.

5 The general rule is to preclude it. And then the state has to show a reason why some

7 exception applies. And it just says, it is not

admissible to prove action and conformity

therewith. That is exactly what the state is

10 alleging. The state is alleging, oh, you did it in

11 2005, then you must have done it in 2009.

12 That's the exact argument the state is 13 making. And it is exactly precluded by

Rule 404(b). So even though they're now labeling

it "causation," it is exactly 404(b). 15

Now, the point is that if they had some alternate theory and they wanted to say, hey, Your Honor, you know what? It's not actually 404(b).

19 What it really is is causation, well, they had a

20 motion cut-off date where they could have filed a

motion and we could have litigated this and won,

22 frankly, months ago and not be dealing with it

23 today, and not have this risk that we tried eight

weeks of a case -- you know -- under a certain

ruling and now -- you know -- they have this new

44

43

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

16

17

theory, well, actually, it's not 404(b). It's not 1 2 action in conformity therewith. It's not to prove the similarity, which it actually is. But that's not what it is. What it really is is to show this new buzz word, "causation."

6 Yeah. And -- you know -- Ms. Do points 7 out to me that under Rule 404(b), Your Honor, absence of mistake and accident is, in fact, 8 9 causation. I mean, that's -- that's, in fact, what 10 that means under 404(b). And the Court ruled on 11 exactly this ground in its February ruling.

you know -- Dr. Lyon testified here in court. He's the medical examiner who examined at least two of the victims. He said that he could not --

The last thing I'd just say is that --

15 16 basically, his diagnosis was 51 percent that it was heat stroke. 51 percent. 17

And where is the evidence -- what burden are we going to give -- you know -- what burden does the state get to use on these prior acts, even where people have actually died and the medical examiner has actually looked at the bodies, conducted all the tests, looked at the medical records, and has come to a conclusion that it's --

you know -- 51 percent chance that these folks died

46

of heat stroke?

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

What burden now? The state can just put up lay witnesses to say, oh, yeah. No tests. No nothing. Just their sort of observations. Oh, yeah. It was all heat-related illness, and they were all on the verge of death. The Court has heard all of those witnesses testify.

When we have a medical examiner who can't even say beyond a reasonable doubt that these folks died of heat stroke, now we're going to have some random folks get up there and say, well -- you know -- it looks like heat stroke to me. That's not appropriate, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Li, when you phrase it that way, that really points up what the problem was in the 404(b) hearing. That was presented to me as a 404(b) issue with a pretty specific argument regarding the acceptable purpose. And I made a ruling with regard to that.

MR. LI: But it's the state's burden to identify what purposes they want to use the evidence.

23 THE COURT: I'm just pointing out I dealt with 24 that as a 404(b) issue. That's what I'm saying. 25

MR. LI: I understand that, Your Honor. But

had the state decided that, you know what, we

didn't mean 404(b) when we noticed it as 404(b)?

3 Remember, we didn't raise -- we didn't notice it as

4 404(b). The state noticed these events as 404(b).

We then, in response and reliance on the state's

representations to us as to what purposes it's

using evidence, filed the appropriate motions

8 within the appropriate motion cut-off time so that

we can shape the litigation in a way that hopefully

10 evidence comes in in an orderly manner.

11 If the state had intended to make some 12 different argument about these prior acts, if the 13 state had said, listen -- you know -- it's 404(b) 14 and it's this other theory of causation, they need 15 to litigate it in an orderly manner, not while 16 we're sitting here eight weeks into trial.

17 And I understand the Court ruled -- you 18 know -- the Court is saying that it ruled on the 19 basis of what it was presented with. I would 20 submit to the Court what it was presented with is 21 what the state indicated it was going to use its 22 evidence for.

23 The defense doesn't -- you know -- the 24 state has a pattern of continually making everything that they do our fault somehow. It is

3

4

not our burden, Your Honor, to tell the state how it's going to use its evidence. We can only react to what the state tells us.

They never ever filed a motion to this court saying, Your Honor, we want to submit all of these prior acts because it demonstrated causation.

What they did instead was they filed a 404(b)

notice. And we litigated that exact issue. And

9 that's the issue that was presented to the Court.

10 It is not the defense that sandbagged 11 some issue. It's the prosecution that has utterly failed to notify the Court until -- you know -- it

13 comes up with new theories -- you know -- recently

14 that causation is all of a sudden a surprising

15 issue, when we noted causation as a defense in

16 March 2010.

THE COURT: First of all, with regard to foundation, it would be helpful if questions were phrased with Rule 602 in mind. Because even asking a question, do you know this, sometimes the response comes back, yes.

How do you know?

Well, because somebody told me. And if the question is phrased at the

25 outset with 602 in mind, you don't get there. You

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

don't even get that risk of somebody suggesting 1 that somebody else told you some kind of 2 information, and you can avoid that.

I've indicated at bench that sometimes a question of that nature, especially when someone very likely has knowledge, will get someone to the area and you can go on and expedite the trial. But that would help.

The issue really comes down to 404(b) and whether it even applies in this situation. And I've mentioned before that I've been somewhat 12 puzzled, because a lot of the evidence that I heard at 404(b) was consistent with what evidence that's already come in about what would be expected in a sweat lodge. Very -- very similar. So it's been puzzling that that's been presented.

17 And in some respect it's puzzling that it 18 would be presented in terms of prior bad act. And I know it's other acts. It's not necessarily a 19 20 prior bad act. But that's really what the rule fundamentally is about, having bad acts come in 21 22 that would suggest propensity. So the jury is going to ignore what acceptable purpose might be 23 24 out there and only get the propensity message from 25 it, the improper message.

So it's been a very unusual presentation to have really a lot of what was in the 404(b)

3 hearing, essentially, not contested. I did make a

4 finding in that hearing that the state proved

various things by clear and convincing evidence. 5

6 And one thing was the general way in which sweat

7 lodges were conducted previously at Spiritual

8 Warrior.

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

1

9

10

24

I think and conclude that the issue really comes down to whether this evidence really 11 isn't intrinsic type evidence. I think the overall approach from the state and what's been litigated 12 13 here is explaining -- or the way I see it, it's 14 some kind of explanation for what happens in 2009 15 and what might be relevant to that. And is it 16 really something -- is it talking about prior bad

acts to talk about what happens in sweat lodges? 17 18 I'm having trouble -- you know -- when 19 it's phrased in the way you -- right at the end, 20 Mr. Li, because that's the way the state phrased it. People were going to come up and, basically, 21 22 say this is identical conduct year after year after 23 year. Basically, a series of reckless acts year

1 the case.

9

10

11

12

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 Dr. Lyon made the distinction between the level of illness. Heat exhaustion, which is not 4 serious, something that can be taken care of, versus heat stroke, which is a life-threatening condition. And I pointed out that there wasn't any evidence of a life-threatening condition at any time prior.

When you make your arguments, Mr. Li, you always get back to this is what the state's going to do. And the ruling is very clear that can't be done.

13 MR. LI: Your Honor, my concern is this: This 14 is -- it's our view that the reality of this is that hundreds of people went through this and did 15 16 not have life-threatening conditions. Okay? I 17 think that's the actual reality of what actually happened from 2005 to 2008. 18

The problem that we have identified in the state's presentation of the evidence is that the way the evidence comes in is almost always inflammatory. And so you have witnesses who are not qualified to talk about any of this, not qualified to make any medical diagnosis, talking about how people were dying, how they were

50

unconscious, how they were in convulsions and all

of that. And that has a grossly and unfair

prejudicial effect where the jurors are hearing

things that are, frankly, just inflammatory. We

5 believe untrue, but just inflammatory. And then

they draw the propensity conclusion, which is

7 inappropriate.

8 And I guess the problem that we have is twofold, Your Honor. If this were simply just as a 10 procedural matter to start with. Okay? As a 11 procedural matter, if the state's argument was, 12 well, it's intrinsic and it's causation and that's 13 what it is, that's what they should have said so. That's what they should have said when we were 15 litigating this issue instead of eight weeks into 16 trial.

17 Eight weeks into trial -- and if that was going to be the Court's ruling, that you know what, 18 19 all this stuff comes in. We're going to have 20 arguments about what it all means. But this -- all 21 of this evidence comes in because it's intrinsic. 22 then our opening statement would have been 23 different. The way we structured our case would 24 have been different. We would be more arguing

about these prior -- we would, basically, Your

after year after year. That was the way it was

urged. And I could not -- I just found that wasn't

1 Honor, be having minitrials about the various prior

- 2 sweat lodges to demonstrate that when some witness
- gets up there and says some inflammatory comment
- about what happened and what the various medical
- conditions are, we would now have somebody say,
- 6 well, that's actually not true. Here's what
- 7 actually happened. And then we would have, for
- each year -- you know -- a few witnesses get up 8
- there and sort of argue with each other about what
- 10 actually happened during those sweat lodges.

That's not what the Court wanted to have

12 happen, and that's the way we read this ruling.

Because they were not substantially similar.

And, Your Honor, I do disagree with the Court's idea that 404(b) is somehow a limited -this ruling is somehow limited. 404(b), first of all, it's not limited to bad acts, as the Court has pointed out. It's other acts. And the main thing

we're trying to avoid is the idea of propensity. 20 Okay?

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

1

2

7

14

15

16

17

18

And in general, the rule prohibits exactly what the state is proffering. That is,

23 something happened in 2005; therefore, it must have

happened in 2009. Something happened in 2007; 24

25

therefore, it must have happened in 2009.

Something happened in 2008; therefore, it must have happened in 2009.

3 That is exactly what the rule prohibits.

And the Rule 404(b) hearing was about whether or 4

5 not these prior acts -- whether these other acts

6 fall within the narrow exceptions to propensity.

I would submit, Your Honor, when the statute says -- when -- you know -- absence of

8

9 mistake and accident is, in fact, causation. That

10 is to say, you didn't accidentally do it; you

11 caused it to happen because you knew. You knew it

12 was going to be this way. I mean, that is -- you

13 know -- causation.

> And so I don't think that the rule is as narrow as the Court is interpreting -- or stating it is right now. I mean, I think the rule is actually a general preclusion of propensity evidence.

19 THE COURT: Absolutely a general preclusion of 20 propensity evidence. And that's its sole purpose. It would be precluded. 21

22 MR. LI: Now -- you know -- my partners here 23 point out that the causation that the state noticed was actually this Rick Ross fellow, who is going to 24 25 testify about cults and large group awareness

training, and then Mr. Pace. That's where the

state was going with its causation arguments,

saying that -- you know -- somehow Mr. Ray's words

55

caused these people to do various things. This

whole idea, Your Honor, it just --5

6 THE COURT: Mr. Li, thank you. You know, 7 you've made your argument.

8 What has to be avoided is testimony that

9 does not rest on solid foundation. And in the

10 404(b) I saw quite a bit of that. The

11 characterization of the photographs in 2008.

12 People were apparently -- I think you'd see this in

13 the statements that were just given, the transcript

14 of statements. There are hundreds of pages of

those where people would say things that were not

16 consistent with what actually was shown here in

17 court.

18 That's a whole different question than what evidence goes to explaining what happened 20 in 2009. And it is easiest to see in terms of 21 prior bad act because there has been no evidence of 22 a prior bad act. The real question is is this

23 really other-act evidence that's being discussed

24 and being proposed?

There has been some expert testimony now.

56

There has been the talk of the spectrum of

heat-related illnesses. And Dr. Cutshall, to my

3 recollection, testified concerning length of

exposure to the heat, that kind of thing, to be a

5 factor. So there has been some expert testimony

6 now.

some.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

25

7 And you recall after hearing Jennifer Haley's testimony, I indicated there would be no testimony regarding prior sweat lodge events until 10 there was expert testimony. And there has been

I also found with regard to Ms. Haley that the testimony she gave also had what I labeled a non-404(b) purpose. And that -- that's an imprecise term I probably -- would probably not use as much or at least provide some explanation. But that evidence also explained what she was doing and why she did what she did in 2009, what she had mentioned about the 2007.

So there has been some expert testimony regarding heat illnesses -- heat-related illnesses. 22 And I indicated in my ruling on the 404(b) -- that was one of the issues that arose there. There was no medical testimony or evidence provided. The only evidence provided was evidence that showed

14 of 71 sheets

```
57
 1
    there was no life-threatening condition with Daniel
 2
    P's records, a nonemergency type situation.
 3
              So I'm going to permit the evidence.
    There has to be accurate foundation. It can't be
    stressed beyond what the witness can provide.
 6
              And with regard to observations, that
7
    they come up regarding any kind of medical
    condition, there just cannot be
 8
9
    mischaracterization. It has to be what is actually
10
    observed.
11
              Mr. Li.
12
         MR. LI: Your Honor, two things. One is this
13
    just -- there is no 403 analysis at all in this.
14
    And there is a 403 issue here which is going to be
    highlighted by my second point, which is these are
15
    witnesses who -- you know -- the state does not do
16
17
    things to try to control their testimony. The
    state does not ask questions --
18
19
         THE COURT: Well, Mr. Li, objections can be
20
    made. I've allowed a number of bench conferences
    in this case. I would like to minimize that.
21
22
              Ms. Polk, is anything unclear about what
    I've said so far?
23
24
         MS. POLK: No, Your Honor.
25
         THE COURT: Mr. Li?
```

is this: That they have a tendency -- you know -we saw days of it. They have a tendency -- there was 40 people who were dying, and then you have to sort of pull it back. 6 THE COURT: It's -- testimony such as that would risk a mistrial. And there has been sufficient warning now that if that were to happen, it implicates more than just a mistrial. 10 MR. LI: The second point I would make, Your 11 Honor -- the question I would ask, Your Honor, is the Court now intending to allow other witnesses of 12 all of the prior sweat lodges to come in and start testifying about the prior sweat lodges with -- at least with respect to Mr. Mercer and Debbie Mercer, 15 16 they were at -- you know -- two or three sweat 17 lodges. Okay? 18 There are some people who are at -- you 19 know -- 2005 and no -- at no other sweat lodges. 20 Now, are we going to have those people come in and do we next need now to go get witnesses to rebut 21 22 all of these? 23 I mean, some of the things these people say are crazy, frankly. There's at least one 24 25 witness from 2005 who describes Daniel P. who did

MR. LI: Yeah. And the problem -- the problem

58

1 MR. LI: Your Honor -- I'm sorry. I 2 apologize. This is obviously a bit of a surprise to me. And I did not think that this is what we 3 4 were going to be doing today. 5 Honestly, Your Honor, this -- we have to 6 talk about our legal options. 7 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to start the trial here in a moment, Mr. Li. And with regard to 403, 8 9 part of that is what I've mentioned before. The 10 evidence that already has come in about the extreme 11 physical challenge, if you want to phrase it that way, what type of mental state you might 12 experience, those kinds of things. I factored all 13 14 of that into looking at is this -- if the testimony is appropriately -- it should be very brief. 15 16 But if there is testimony related to 17 actual observations, I don't see it really extending much beyond what I've just mentioned. So 18 19 that -- I have made a 403 analysis. I have. 20 MR. LI: What I anticipate hearing, Your Honor, just given these witnesses and given all the 21 time we've spent with them, is that they go out, 22 23 and then they have to retreat.

THE COURT: Well, that's an absolute risk of a

60 not have a life-threatening condition, as having his brain boiling. Like literally, that's what the 3 guy said. 4 THE COURT: If that testimony were to come out, there would be real mistrial implications if 6 something like that were to happen. 7 Ms. Polk, we're talking about these hypotheticals. Is there a risk of this? 8 9 MS. POLK: No, Your Honor. 10 But I want to respond, first of all. 11 Mr. Li's comments have been sprinkled with attacks 12 on the state and what has happened in the past. And I don't want to address all of that except to just state for the record that that is not what has 15 occurred. 16 THE COURT: I'm assuming it's -- well, go 17 ahead. I was looking prospectively. But go ahead. 18 MS. POLK: And prospectively we will direct witnesses to limit their testimony to what they personally have observed. But I would also note 20 that Rule 701, opinion testimony by lay witnesses,

allows the witness's testimony in the form of

opinions or inferences which are, A, rationally

based on the perception of the witness and, B,

opinions or inferences if they are limited to those

mistrial.

24

25

22

23

16 of 71 sheets

helpful to a clear understanding of the witness's 2 testimony or the determination of a fact in issue.

3 So clearly a witness can testify that they thought the person was unconscious or that 4 they thought that person was vomiting. Those are 6 rational inferences based on what they are 7 observing. And that is admissible.

But there has never been a witness who has come into this court and said 40 people were dying. That's just an exaggeration. That hasn't happened. And that won't happen.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

2

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We will restrict the witnesses to what they have observed, recognizing that Rule 701 allows them to use terms that are layperson's terms to describe what they are seeing.

THE COURT: And I think a lot of that has been introduced already. I don't think the defense has objected when it's come in in that fashion if it's been a bona fide 701 observation. I don't think that's been the subject of objections.

21 But obviously what you've proffered --22 And I understand, that there may have 23 been some hyperbole in your statement.

But I -- but, Ms. Polk, I do understand what Mr. Li is indicating. Because as I've said,

there were hundreds of pages of transcripts indicating people had some characterizations that would not be appropriate.

MS. POLK: And I agree with that, Your Honor. 4 Those were just transcripts. That's not courtroom testimony. And I agree with what the Court is concerned about. And again, we will direct witnesses to talk about what they personally have observed.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I mean, with all due respect, we have a bench memo that we're going to file shortly relating to prosecutorial misconduct. And with all due respect to Ms. Polk, the reality of this is the state has not observed propriety in asking questions.

I will give several examples that are going to be cited in this bench memorandum. Asking questions like -- over the defense objections repeatedly and sustained objections -- things like -- you know -- did people have a choice when they were unconscious in the sweat lodge? Those sorts of thing. Purely rhetorical, purely prejudicial arguments.

24 With all due respect, I have sincere 25 concerns about the state's willingness and ability to restrain itself from eliciting as inflammatory information as it can.

3 I'll give you another, just one point which really sticks in my craw. This idea that the 4 state has twice articulated in court that a 6 settlement is admissible to prove liability. We 7 have it on record twice Ms. Polk herself has stated. That's false. It is just simply wrong.

9 And we have very little faith that the 10 state will constrain itself to this Court's ruling 11 and to be able to keep these witnesses from veering 12 off the track that the Court has laid.

13 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Li.

14 MR. LI: Your Honor, with all due respect, if 15 this is the direction the Court is going in, we need to figure out whether we're going to move for 17 a mistrial and whether we need to take a special action. Because this -- and I'll let my 19 colleague --

20 THE COURT: We're going to start the trial and 21 have the jury in. Thank you.

22 (Recess.)

25

1

62

THE COURT: The record will show the presence 23 24 of the defendant, Mr. Ray, and the attorneys.

Mr. Li, you wanted to make a motion?

MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor. We move for a mistrial on several grounds. One ground is the

timing of this particular ruling. I think I've

already articulated what our position is on that.

5 But to quickly recap, obviously, we 6 formed a defense with the notice that we were given

by the Court in its ruling. We understand the

ruling to also apply to causation. 404(b) says

lack of absence -- absence of mistake or accident.

10 We obviously contend that this was an accident.

11 And so we believe that we were -- you 12 know -- the timing of the ruling has prejudiced us 13 and deprived Mr. Ray of a fair trial. 14

We also would move for a mistrial based on the substance of the ruling. We obviously have articulated our various positions about why we disagree.

an issue that we raised earlier about the First Amendment and many other issues relating about the various types of testimony that was elicited by the 22 state relating to Mr. Ray's protected speech and

I would throw in, in addition, there is

23 that no guidance has been given. And the state has

not made any effort to comply with any of the

Supreme Court case law relating to speech.

15

16

17

18

19

20

16

17

18

19

25

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

those purposes.

68

We'd also identify -- another ground would be the state's failure to identify a duty and its continued introduction of purported negligence in the evidence.

1

2

4

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

1

3

5 We also have separately -- are going to 6 prepare and file a bench memorandum relating to 7 conduct by the state relating to its questions -prejudicial questions purposely seeking to elict 8 9 improper and inflammatory information; taking legal 10 positions which are, on their face, incorrect; 11 including that relating to the duty issue on 12 negligence cases.

And, Your Honor, other things that we would have done differently had we understood this was the Court's ruling, we obviously would have conducted our cross-examination of the experts in a different way. We believe the defense has been severely prejudiced by this. And for these reasons we're moving for a mistrial.

Mr. Kelly has something to add about another procedure, which I'm not particularly familiar with. And I'll turn it over to Mr. Kelly.

23 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Judge, at the appropriate time.

25 And I believe Ms. Polk probably wants to respond to

the motion for a mistrial, and we await your order 2 in that regard. But after that, Your Honor, I would like to be heard.

4 THE COURT: Ms. Polk.

5 MS. POLK: Your Honor, just briefly, there's 6 no basis for a mistrial. The Court's order of 7 February 3rd, 2011, was clear that the Court was 8 addressing the 404(b) information purposes only.

9 On March 1st, the day of the opening statements,

the Court made it clear that information concerning 10

11 what occurred at other sweat lodge events at the

12 Angel Valley property would be admissible and would

13 be relevant on the issue of causation. And the

14 Court's language was as it becomes relevant at

trial. 15

16

17

18

19

20

The Court has made it clear all along that relevant information will be admissible. Specifically addressed it on March 1st and then again on March 9th when Jennifer Haley testified. The Court again made it clear that information relating to causation and the previous sweat lodge events would be admissible subject to the medical

21 22

information laying the foundation as to the causes 23

24 of the symptoms and causes of heat stroke and

heat-related illnesses. 25

With regard to all the other issues the

2 defense has just raised, some of those matters have

been put forth in motion and already addressed by

the Court. Others, I believe, are still pending.

But none of those would form the basis for a 6 mistrial.

7 THE COURT: Mr. Li, anything else?

8 MR. LI: Your Honor, we would obviously

disagree with the state's characterization of the

10 February 3rd ruling. I cannot stress enough that

Rule 404(b) prohibits propensity evidence, which is 11

12 exactly what the state is offering. Rule 404(b)

13 carves out a limited exception for things like

14 absence of mistake and accident. And those would

15 be potentially causation-related issues.

The Court's ruling is quite clear that the prior testimony was not -- the prior testimony relating to prior incidents was not admissible for

20 This causation issue is sort of a strange 21

hybrid issue that has come up through the arguments 22 relating to organophosphates and what have you.

23 And the only relevant issue, in my view, is whether

24 the sweat lodges are the same or not.

Because if you can't prove that the sweat

lodges are the same or maintained in the same way,

then it's irrelevant what happened at a prior sweat

3 lodges. It does not establish -- here's what could

have happened: Somebody could have sprayed some

organophosphates into the dirt. They could have

sprayed it into the tarps unbeknownst to a lot of

different people, certainly unbeknownst to Mr. Ray.

8 And it could have happened in June 2009.

And that's the causation issue that we understood the Court was talking about. But this idea that propensity evidence establishes causation is exactly what Rule 404(b) prohibits and what we believe the Court's ruling prohibited.

14 THE COURT: With regard to the timing, I 15 recall, Mr. Li, that your opening statement was 16 actually broken. It was done on one day, and then the next morning we started -- as a matter of fact, I forgot to announce you first, because normally 19 openings are completed on one day.

20 And there was discussion about the 21 potential for this evidence coming in specifically 22 with regard to causation. Is there any dispute 23 about that?

24 MR. LI: Your Honor, it depends on what you mean by "causation." 25

1 THE COURT: Well --

2 MR. LI: And that's critical, Your Honor.

Because if "causation" means lack of mistake or

- accident -- okay -- which is causation. Your Honor. 4
- And that's exactly what the defense theory is:
- 6 This is an accident. Okay?

7 And so if that's what the Court's ruling 8 was, then that would be a change from the Court's

9 ruling in February 2011.

So from our point of view, in February 2011 the Court made a ruling that relates to causation, absence of mistake and/or accident.

13 Okay?

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

6

7

8

10

11

So we believe that that was what the Court's ruling was vis-à-vis causation.

What we understand "causation" to mean, which we don't agree with and is obviously over our objection -- but what we understand this new theory of causation is, is somehow to say that it was not organophosphates or some sort of insecticide or some sort of toxin that killed these folks, but that there was some other cause, some other mechanism that caused these folks to die.

24 And yesterday, we discussed exactly this

issue with Mr. Mercer and provided to you the

transcript of that discussion, which demonstrates

- 2 that he has no personal knowledge about the
- condition of the sweat lodge in October 2009 as 3
- 4 compared to any other sweat lodge at any other

5 time.

> And so we believe that at this point that argument is done. Because now you cannot link the sweat lodge from 2009 in any causal way to an

9 earlier sweat lodge.

For instance, if Mr. Mercer -- if this had been a house -- okay? If this had been a sweat

12 house stationed at Angel Valley, and it never

13 changed and we had perfect records of the

14 maintenance and what have you, you could have an

15 argument, then, relating to causation, if it was

16 exactly the same in October 2009 as it was in May

17 2009 and as it was in October 2008. You could just

18 demonstrate it going each time back. Then you

19 could make a causation argument.

20 And we believe that that's what the Court 21 was talking about, that yeah. You might be able to 22 go back and talk about prior sweat lodges if you

23 could establish that there's a link -- you know --

24 either in the harms that took place, which the

Court explicitly ruled out, or in the actual

material or what have you that is being used in the sweat lodge.

3 Then you could say, well -- you know --

we have a perfect chain of custody. This thing was 4 not poisoned in 2008, and yet people -- you know --

6 seemed to get sick. And then in 2009 they die.

And you can't -- you know -- this whole --

organophosphates or insecticide or any of these

9 things, it's just speculation.

10 Because we've proved that there is no 11 causal link anymore. Okay? And the state can't do 12 that. Okay? The state cannot. Because their

13 witness who assembled the sweat lodge says that the

14 materials are not the same.

> So, yes, Your Honor. I do -- it was a long-winded way of answering your question. But you asked me whether I dispute that there was a discussion about causation. I do if what the Court means is causation means absence of mistake or accident.

If what the Court was talking about relating to causation is are these the same sweat lodges, is there some way to rebut the causal link that we're making here that Mr. Ray somehow caused

people to die because he knew that there was

70

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

organophosphates or something like that in the dirt

or in the tarps, that would be -- that's a

3 causation argument that we understand.

4 But we don't understand the reversal of the 404(b) ruling, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: There has been no reversal of 404(b).

7 8 MR. LI: I understand that that's the Court's

position. But that's our position. We believe 10 that if the Court is saying that absence of mistake

11 and/or lack of accident, which are our causal

12 defenses, is encompassed in the ruling in February

13 2011, then our contention is that we did understand

that that portion of causation was discussed in

15 your February 2011 ruling.

16 We understood the causation that you were 17 describing having to do with the various -- the 18 form and the maintenance of the sweat lodges and 19 whether there is a link between what happened 20 in 2009, October, and in any other instance.

THE COURT: And I think, Ms. Polk, you were only talking about this in the latter sense, of having to do with what was the physical cause of injury.

25 MS. POLK: Correct.

21

22

23

23

24

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

76

THE COURT: Okay. And there may need to be limiting instructions on that.

1

2 3

4

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

I've said this before, too. There's no summary judgment in criminal actions. There are Rule 20 motions. And I'll address that in the context of duty.

I have made clear, I think, there has to be a finding of the duty for an omission that lies outside the criminal statute that's relied on. At the same time, there's no mechanism to implement that other than a Rule 20, essentially, once the matter is at trial. So that's noted.

With regard to the First Amendment, I've indicated that in the context of duty, words have a whole different meaning. And I don't want to give hypotheticals. You can think about it, and you can think of a number of hypotheticals. When in the context of a legal duty, somebody makes a representation that somebody else relies on, it's not protected speech.

The questions with regard to foundation -- those are questions of weight. As I said, there's not a summary judgment mechanism that's available in this context.

So the motion for mistrial is denied.

74

Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Judge, what we would request right now is a brief stay in the jury trial for various reasons. One is I don't believe that we're prepared to go forward given the Court's recent ruling in regards to the cross-examination of the proposed witnesses.

I'll provide a simple example. I'm going to cross-examine Debbie Mercer. When she and her transcript of the November testimony spoke of prior act evidence, I skipped over it. When I say "prior act evidence," from the evidence relating from prior sweat lodges. I skipped over that.

So in good faith, I don't believe that any of us are prepared to proceed at this point in time given our ethical responsibility to represent Mr. Ray.

Secondly and more importantly, Judge, we intend to discuss the propriety of filing a special action to challenge your ruling this morning. And I would ask you to think of this, Judge. If, in fact, that special action were to prevail and the witnesses continue to testify -- well, let me rephrase it.

If in the special action we challenged

1 your ruling and the higher court overruled it, in the meantime witnesses were allowed to testify, then we would automatically have a mistrial.

4 So I think the wisdom would dictate that 5 there would be a break in the trial today to allow us to consult as to the propriety of filing a 7 special action.

8 Of course, if we did file the complaint for special action, it would articulate the reasons 9 for the requested stay. But as I stand here today 10 at 10:30 in the morning, we're caught off guard and 12 believe that that's the best we can do.

13 I know, Judge, that within -- after 14 listening to your explanation a moment ago in 15 response to the motion for a mistrial, within a couple of hours, we could notify the Court whether 16 17 we intended to file the special action. I would 18 say by probably 1:00 or 1:30. Then, of course, there's the actual filing of the brief -- the 19 20 pleading itself. 21

So that's our request, Judge, is to 22 simply, at least for -- between now and 1:30, to stay these proceedings to allow us to consult. Because we're completely caught off guard. I don't

25 want to reiterate the arguments of Mr. Li, but I

was the one that handled the witness Fawn Foster.

2 I heard the representations that was made as to the

purposes of this evidence. I listened to your

responses. We came prepared today consistent with

your responses last Friday, and now we're caught

6 off guard.

7 So whether -- you know -- I'm not implying that that's your fault or anyone else's.

It's just simply the fact of the matter. We were proceeding in this case along one course that none

11 of these prior incidents would ever be mentioned;

12 and then all of a sudden, now today they are.

And we'll have a witness here in a few minutes -- in fact, the next three or four or five witnesses are all going to discuss those prior sweat lodge incidents.

So we'd ask for a brief stay and perhaps longer, if we have more time to consult.

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes.

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the state opposes a stay.

22 The issue of whether this evidence could come in for causation purposes was addressed by the Court 23

24 and the parties early on in March. And the Court

made the determination that if there was the 25

77

80

1 medical testimony, that that evidence would be permitted. The defense has been aware of that 3 ruling since early March.

5

8 9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24 25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

21

22

23

Last week the Court addressed the issue involving Ms. Foster and indicated that we could recall her later in our case again if we could lay 7 foundation about the tarps and the structure that was used. So that part of the Court's ruling, again, was something the defense has known since last week, that the state would be permitted to talk about prior sweat lodges with Ms. Foster.

The defense has had time since early March, when the Court indicated that it intended to 14 allow causation evidence if the state could lay foundation of what a witness clearly observed and if we could offer that medical evidence that linked it to becoming relevant.

The defense has had ample time to prepare a special action on that ruling. The decision today is not a surprise. We're mid trial. We lost an entire day yesterday because of a juror being 22 Ill. We were able to get an interview done of Mr. Mercer yesterday. We have an interview set for lunch today of the Hamiltons.

But to say that we can delay this trial,

which is midway through and has months to go, for an indefinite period of time is unrealistic. 2

3 Particularly since these issues are not new or

4 novel issues. They're issues that the defense has

5 been aware of for some time.

So the state would oppose a stay. 6

7 THE COURT: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Judge, if I could reply briefly.

First of all, the only thing I agree with Mr. Hughes was last Friday you talked about the foundation which would be necessary to admit evidence regarding the May 2009 sweat lodge constructed by Mr. Mercer.

And, Judge, for the record, I would simply ask you to refer to the interview of Mr. Mercer, which, I believe, has been marked as -probably marked as 812 would be the most recent interview, page 10.

19 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: I just -- for the record, Judge, again --

MR. LI: If I may approach with a courtesy copy, Your Honor?

24 THE COURT: Okay. Oh. Here it is. What

25 page? 1 MR. KELLY: Page 10 and page 11, lines 1 and 2, where Mr. Mercer says, so, you're, basically, quessing?

He responds, I guess so. Yes.

5 That's the final conclusion by Mr. Mercer as to the -- as to whether or not the identical 7 materials were used between May of '09 and October of '09.

9 And I agree with Mr. Hughes. When we 10 left on Friday, that was the issue presented by the Court and that's the issue that was addressed by 11

12 Mr. Li in this interview as set forth as

Exhibit 812. Beyond that, Judge, I'm not going to reargue the causation issue that Mr. Li articulated 14 15 this morning.

16 What I'm saying is in order to protect 17 this jury that a brief stay is necessary to allow 18 us as a defense team to consult whether or not we're going to file a special action. If the 20 answer to that question is yes, we would request a longer stay, a stay long enough for a higher court 21 22 to address this special action, which, in my 23 experience, would be -- would be by next week. 24

And so if the issue in regards to staying these proceedings is do we want to protect this

jury and the evidence thus far? Because I believe

there's been limited evidence presented as to prior

sweat lodge incidents. Then we could simply

proceed.

25

11

78

5 Or if we do file a special action and we do prevail and a higher court says that you cannot go into these prior-act evidence, by that time we'd 8 have an automatic mistrial.

9 So it's simply a common sense request for 10 a stay, one for the next hour, hour and a half, after giving your ruling and response to Mr. Li's 12 motion for a mistrial.

13 And, secondly -- and I suspect our 14 position is to file a special action. But if that is it, to come back after lunch and discuss the 16 timing in regards to the filing of the special 17 action.

18 Judge, my experience is this is not an 19 unusual request that we'd want to protect the 20 trial. I realize it's been eight weeks. Why would we do something that would require us perhaps two 21 22 weeks from now to start all over again? 23 So, again, I'd request a brief stay until perhaps 1:00 o'clock and then address this issue 24 25 again.

	81		83
1	THE COURT: If there is any testimony about	1	haven't been back but once.
2	physical, mental health effects of prior sweat	2	Q. Are you married?
3	lodges, it would be very, very brief in any event.	3	A. Yes. I've been married 25 years.
4	There just isn't a lot of relevance going into	4	Q. What's your wife's name?
5	that. I've said that many times.	5	A. Debra Mercer.
6	The I've indicated there is already	6	Q. Do you have children?
7	evidence that really suggests such things. I mean,	7	A. I have two children, Sarah and Kyle.
8	ready inference. If not direct, certainly from the	8	Q. Do you have grandchildren?
9	statements that have been admitted.	9	A. Two grandchildren. Skyler and Angel.
10	I am not going to grant the request for	10	Q. You mentioned Sarah. How old is Sarah
11	stay. We're going to continue.	11	now?
12	I'm going to say, Mr. Hughes and	12	A. Nineteen.
13	Ms. Polk, think through things carefully.	13	Q. When did she turn 19?
14		14	
15	But what I have right now, I don't see justifying a stay. So we will continue.	15	A. November 2nd of last year.
16	Thank you.	16	Q. When was it that you came out to Arizona?
	·		A. Well, the first time I came to Arizona
17	(Proceedings continued in the presence of	17	was about 1980. Finished up my last year of high
18	the jury.)	18	school. I moved to Hawaii for 8, 10 years, then
19	THE COURT: The record will show the presence	19	went to Chicago for a year. Then I moved back,
20	of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys and the	20	1989, I think it was.
21	JURY. MS. POLK: State calls Ted Mercer, please	22	Q. With your family? A. Yes.
23	MS. POLK: State calls Ted Mercer, please.	23	
24	THE COURT: Sir, please step to the front of the courtroom.	24	Q. Where in Arizona did you and your family then reside?
25	Raise you're right hand and be sworn by	25	A. It was Phoenix. We came and stayed with
\ -	The second secon	123	•
' <u> </u>	82		84
1	the clerk.	1	my folks for a little while. They were in Sun City
3	THEODORE M. MERCER,	3	West. And then we found a place in Phoenix and moved there.
4	having been first duly sworn upon his oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the	4	_
5	truth, testified as follows:	5	·
6	THE COURT: Please be seated here at the	6	the Verde Valley area? A. Yeah. We used to come up here just to
7		7	
8	witness stand. Sir, please begin by stating and spelling your	8	have fun in Sedona in the Red Rocks. We'd come up
9	full name.	9	quite often. Q. Did you come to know a place called
10		10	. ,
11	THE WITNESS: Theodore Martin Mercer; T-h-e-o-d-o-r-e, M-a-r-t-i-n, M-e-r-c-e-r.	11	"Angel Valley"? A. Yes. Eventually we did.
12	THE COURT: Thank you.	12	_
13	Ms. Polk.	13	,
14		14	A. On the Internet. My wife found it on the
15	MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor. DIRECT EXAMINATION	15	Internet. We were up here, and she said, I found
16	BY MS. POLK:	16	this new place. I think it was Memorial weekend and Sedona was packed and we had nowhere to go. So
יין ו	BI MS. FOLK.	17	we ended up going to Angel Valley. And it was
17	Please begin by telling the zury where		we ended up going to Angel valley. And it was
17	Q. Please begin by telling the jury where	- 1	
18	you were born and raised.	18	nobody was there, and it was really nice.
18 19	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for	18 19	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel
18 19 20	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for 18 years. Then I moved to Arizona, finished up my	18 19 20	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel Valley?
18 19 20 21	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for 18 years. Then I moved to Arizona, finished up my last year of high school.	18 19 20 21	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel Valley? A. Yeah.
18 19 20 21 22	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for 18 years. Then I moved to Arizona, finished up my last year of high school. Q. What sort of town was it where you were	18 19 20 21 22	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel Valley? A. Yeah. Q. What year was that?
18 19 20 21 22 23	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for 18 years. Then I moved to Arizona, finished up my last year of high school. Q. What sort of town was it where you were raised? How big of a town?	18 19 20 21 22 23	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel Valley? A. Yeah. Q. What year was that? A. 19 it was '08 we started living there.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for 18 years. Then I moved to Arizona, finished up my last year of high school. Q. What sort of town was it where you were raised? How big of a town? A. 2000 people, counting cats and dogs too,	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel Valley? A. Yeah. Q. What year was that? A. 19 it was '08 we started living there. March of '08.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	you were born and raised. A. I was born in Minnesota, raised there for 18 years. Then I moved to Arizona, finished up my last year of high school. Q. What sort of town was it where you were raised? How big of a town?	18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	nobody was there, and it was really nice. Q. Did you eventually come to live at Angel Valley? A. Yeah. Q. What year was that? A. 19 it was '08 we started living there. March of '08. Q. Do you believe it was what year was

8

88

- 1 it -- did there come a time you started doing
- 2 volunteer work for Angel Valley?
 - Α. Yeah. We volunteered in '07, started doing weeding. We'd stay at their cabins every once in a while, and then that worked into a job.
- 6 You say "we." Who was doing volunteer
- 7 work?

3

4

5

- 8 Α. My wife and I.
- 9 Q. Did you have Sarah with you?
- 10 Α. Sometimes she'd come with us. Yeah.
- 11 Q. During that period of time, where were
- 12 you living?
- 13 Α. I was living in Morristown, Arizona.
- 14 Q. Is that where you live now?
- Α. 15 Yes.
- 16 Q. And would you tell the jury where
- Morristown is. 17
- 18 Morristown is on Grand Avenue as you're 19 going past Sun City as you're going to Las Vegas.
- 20 Everyone says that is the Las Vegas road. About 20
- 21 minutes out of Sun City. Either 20 minutes from
- 22 Sun City or 20 minutes from Wickenburg.
- 23 You mentioned that your volunteer work
- 24 became a job. When were you actually hired by
- 25 Angel Valley?

1

- 86
- A. Well, we moved there in March of '08.
- 2 That's when my employment started.
- 3 Q. What were your employment duties?
- 4 Α. I was the property manager.
- 5 Q. What did that entail?
- 6 Α. Well, we'd -- I would take care of the
- 7 buildings to make sure all the maintenance was done
- 8 on them. When people would come for retreats, we'd
- 9 set up the various buildings or outside areas for
- their activities. 10
- 11 Q. Will you tell the jury who the owners of
- 12 Angel Valley are.
- 13 Α. Michael and Amayra Hamilton.
- Q. Is that who hired you in March of '08? 14
- 15 Α. No. A guy named Gary Palisch hired me.
- 16 Q. What was Gary Palisch's relationship to
- 17 the Hamiltons or Angel Valley?
- 18 Α. He was general manager.
- 19 Q. Gary hired you?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- Q. 21 When was it that you came to actually
- 22 reside or live out at Angel Valley?
- 23 It was March of '07. We moved a trailer
- 24 up onto the property and lived in the trailer for
- 25 about a year.

- I want you to think carefully. You said
- March of '08 and March of '07. Do you remember
- which it is that you --
- 4 Α. It was March of '08 is when we moved 5 there. Yes.
- 6 Q. Is that also when you got the job?
- 7 Α. Yes.
 - Q. Not March of '07?
- 9 Α. No. Before that was all volunteer.
- 10 Q. Did you rent a home out of Angel Valley?
- 11 Α. Yeah. After we lived there and I lived
- 12 in the trailer for '07 from March to December or
- 13 November. And then in November when I knew our
- 14
- employment was going to be terminated there, we
- 15 rented a house. There is two private houses on the
- 16 property. We rented one of them.
- 17 Q. When was it that you first rented one of
- 18 the private houses?
- 19 Α. It was November of '08.
- 20 Q. 2008?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. So to make sure I understand, is it
- 23 only 2008 that you were living and working out in
- 24 Angel Valley?

1

4

5

- 25 A. Yeah. It was March through December.
 - Q. Of '08. Okay. What happened -- you
 - mentioned when you were terminated. Did you cease
- 3 to be employed out at Angel Valley at some point?
 - Α. Yes.
 - Q. When was that?
- 6 Α. That was December of '08.
- 7 Q. Did you continue to live out there?
 - Α. Yes. We lived there for a whole year
- 9 until the next November of '09.
- 10 Q. Were you working during that time?
- 11 Α. No, I wasn't.
- 12 Q. Had you already agreed with the owners of
- 13 Angel Valley to do certain events in 2009?
- 14 Yeah. There was one sweat lodge that I
- agreed to do with a lady named Healing Wolf. And 15
- 16 that was set up a whole year ahead of time. So I
- 17 was --- I told her that I would do that. Because I
- 18 know her personally and I wanted to be there for 19 her too.
- 20 Q. Do you recall what month and what year
- 21 that particular event was?
- 22 Α. I couldn't tell you what month. But it 23
 - was in '09.
- 24 Q. And you were still living on the property
- then? 25

- 1 Α. That's correct.
- 2 Q. And did you perform some work in
- connection with that sweat lodge in 2009?
- I set up the sweat lodge, and I was the Α. fire keeper. 5
- 6 Q. And then was there a second sweat lodge
- 7 in 2009 that you performed services for?
 - A. The James Ray sweat lodge. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you recall that that was October
- of 2009? 10

- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. You mentioned during the time that you
- 13 were property manager building some teepees out at
- 14 Angel Valley.
- 15 Α. That's correct.
- 16 MS. POLK: May I approach the witness, Your
- 17 Honor?
- 18 THE COURT: You may.
- 19 BY MS. POLK: Mr. Mercer, I'm going to
- 20 show you Exhibits 830, 832 and 833 and just ask if
- you recognize these. 21
- 22 Α. Yes. I recognize them.
- 23 Q. What do you recognize them to be?
- 24 Α. Teepees that we put up twice. Because
- 25 the first time we didn't do a very good job at it,
- 1 and we had to redo it. But yeah.
- 2 Q. Do you recognize them to be teepees out
- 3 at Angel Valley?
- 4 Α. Yes. Teepees out at Angel Valley.
- 5 Because I can recognize the two cabins right next
- 6 to it.
- 7 MS. POLK: I move for the admission of
- 8 Exhibits 830, 832 and 833.
- 9 MR. LI: No objection.
- 10 THE COURT: 830, 832 and 833 are admitted.
- 11 (Exhibits 830, 832 and 833 admitted.)
- 12 Q. BY MS. POLK: Mr. Mercer, I'm going to
- 13 put up on the overhead 830. Will you point to the
- teepee that you testified that you put up. 14
- 15 A. That one right there.
- Q. 16 And are you able to tell the jury what
- 17 this building next to it is?
- 18 Α. It's a house for guests to stay in, just
- 19 a cabin.
- 20 Q. Once you put up the teepees, did they
- 21 stay up?
- 22 Α. Yeah. They stayed up -- they stayed up
- 23 all year.
- 24 Q. And I'm going to put up on the overhead
- Exhibit 832 and ask if you know who was it that

- 1 would stay, what sorts of clients of Angel Valley
- 2 would stay in the teepees?

89

6

- We put those up specifically for James 3
- Ray because there was a lot of people coming, and 4
 - so we had to have extra room for them.
 - Q. Do you recall what year you put them up?
- 7 Yeah. '08. '08. The same time --
- 8 just after we built the sweat lodge, we put it up.
- 9 I want to ask you a few questions about
- 10 the use of chemicals at the Angel Valley Retreat
- Center. Are you familiar with a policy by the 11
- 12 Hamiltons with respect to the use of chemicals on
- 13 their property?
- 14 MR. LI: Objection. Calls for hearsay. Lack
- 15 of foundation.
- 16 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 17 MS. POLK: Your Honor, could his answer -- I
- was going to lay foundation. Could his answer --18
- 19 yes, he is familiar --
- 20 THE COURT: We talked about 602. I'm
- 21 sustaining the objection.
- 22 BY MS. POLK: During the time you were at
- 23 Angel Valley, did you ever use any chemicals of any
- 24 sort?

2

8

12

19

90

- Α. No. We weren't allowed to --
- 25
 - 1 MR. LI: Move to strike.
 - He can testify about he knows about.

- 3 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 4 BY MS. POLK: Mr. Mercer, when -- if I
- can just ask you, when I ask you a question, if
- it's just a yes or no, then just tell me yes or no,
- 7 and I'll ask the next question.
 - Α. Oh. Okay.
- 9 My question was did you ever use any
- 10 chemicals during the time that you were out at
- 11 Angel Valley?
 - A. No.
- 13 Q. Specifically when you first started
- 14 volunteering out at Angel Valley, what chores or
- 15 duties were you doing?
- 16 We were weeding around the cabins because
- 17 the weeds were so high. We chopped them down with
- 18 a hula hoe.
 - Q. What is a hula hoe?
- 20 Α. A hula hoe is a hoe that you hold with
- 21 two hands, and you swing it back and forth and you
- 22 cut the weeds down. So you cut them down right at
- 23 the ground level.
- 24 Did you ever use any chemicals to kill Q.
- any of those weeds? 25

No. Α.

1

4

5

17

18

19

20

1

11

- 2 Q. Any of the people that you were working with, did you observe anybody else use chemicals, pesticides or herbicides to get rid of those weeds?
 - Α. No, I did not.
- 6 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 7 Exhibit 140, Mr. Mercer. Do you recognize what
- that is a map of? 8
- 9 Α. Angel Valley.
- 10 Q. And specifically do you recognize the areas where you erected teepees? 11
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 Q. Can you show the jury. Just mark on the overhead. 14
- 15 A. It's right there. And the other one is 16 right here.
 - **Q.** And can you show the jury where the cabins were that guests at Angel Valley would stay.
 - A. Well, two of them are right here by this teepee, by the first teepee that I showed. So right here in this area. And then all along here
- 21 22 were cabins people would stay in. And then this
- house right here people would stay in. And then 23
- this was -- these other two were private houses. 24
- 25 And then this house here was the kitchen. So it
- was -- they would stay mostly over here with the --2 where all the big cabins were.
- 3 **Q.** And, again, these are yes no questions.
- 4 Α. Okay.
- 5 Q. During the time that you were at Angel
- 6 Valley, beginning in 2007 through -- I guess you
- 7 haven't testified when it was that you left yet.
- 8 From 2007 through 2009 did you ever use any
- chemicals at any of the areas you've just shown us? 9
- 10 Α. No, I have not.
 - **Q.** Will you show the jury where the sweat
- lodge is at Angel Valley. Do you see it? 12
- 13 Α. It's right there.
- 14 Q. During your time at Angel Valley, was
- that always the location for the sweat lodge? 15
- A. That's correct. Yes. 16
- 17 Q. And this is a yes/no question. During
- 18 your time at Angel Valley from 2007 through 2009,
- 19 did you ever use any chemicals in the area of the
- 20 sweat lodge?
- 21 Α. No.
- 22 Q. And did you ever personally observe
- 23 anybody else use any chemicals in that area?
- A. 24 No.
- 25 Q. Did you ever observe anybody use any

- chemicals anywhere on the Angel Valley property
- from 2007 through 2009?
- 3 Just with the laundry. But it was
- natural soap that we used. I don't know if that's 4
 - a chemical or not. But no.
 - Q. Where was the laundry facility?
- 7 The laundry facility was in this building
- 8 here.

6

9

11

15

- Q. And it was you say a natural detergent?
- 10 Α. Yeah.
 - Q. I want to talk a little bit about the
- 12 sweat lodge structure and the coverings used on a
- 13 sweat lodge. We're going to come back and talk
- more about how you constructed the sweat lodge. 14
 - But first tell the jury where all of the
- 16 coverings that are used for a sweat lodge -- where
- 17 were they stored?
- 18 MR. LI: Objection. Lack of foundation. Time
- 19 frame.
- 20 THE COURT: Basis of knowledge also.
- 21 Sustained.
- 22 Q. BY MS. POLK: I'll back up.
- 23 Mr. Mercer, during the time you were at
- 24 Angel Valley, did you have any job duties with
- respect to that sweat lodge?
 - Α. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And tell the jury when it was that you
- 3 first had any duties with respect to the sweat
- 4 lodge.

1

2

5

94

- The first time we had any duties was in
- 6 '07. And we put the sweat lodge together the first
- 7 time.
- 8 Q. Were you an employee or this was
- 9 volunteer?
- 10 Α. I was volunteering.
- 11 **Q.** Who were you working for?
- 12 Α. I guess Michael Hamilton.
- 13 Q. And what did you specifically do in 2009
- 14 with respect to the sweat lodge?
- 15 We got all the blankets and the tarps and 16
- everything and put it on top of the sweat lodge. 17 And we put the blankets on first and then the tarps
- 18 on after that.
- 19 **Q.** Where were the blankets and tarps that
- you got? Where did you get them from? 20
- 21 A. From a pump house about 300 yards or so 22 away from the sweat lodge.
 - **Q.** Do you see the pump house on this map?
- 24 Α. Yeah. It's right there, I guess. I
- wasn't sure. That's it right next to the pond.

- 1 Q. Is it the blue structure?
- 2 A. Yeah. That I messed up there.
- **Q.** Does it say "Well P"?
- 4 A. Yeah.
- **Q.** That's the pump house?
- 6 A. Yeah. That's the pump house.
- **Q.** Who were you with when you got the
- 8 coverings out of the pump house?
- 9 A. My wife, Debbie.
- **Q.** How did you know that the coverings were
- 11 in the pump house?
- 12 A. I think Gary told us that's where they
- 13 were.
- 14 Q. And then once you got the coverings out
- 15 of the pump house, where did you take them?
- A. We took them over by the sweat lodge
 and -- you know -- they piled them up in the back
- 18 of my truck. And then we just put them on there.
- 19 Q. You drove them, then, from Well P down to20 the sweat lodge?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- **Q.** Will you tell the jury about how far that
- 23 is.

1

8

9

- 24 A. 300 yards.
- 25 Q. And will you take a moment to tell the

- property, but I was in a private house that theydidn't own.
- **Q.** Will you explain that to the jury how it
- 4 is that there is a private house in Angel Valley?
- A. Well, I think this a long time ago was
- 6 homesteaded. And this house right here and this
- 7 house right here are private property owned by
- 8 other people. And this is the house here that I
- 9 rented.
- **10 Q.** The remainder of the property is owned by
- 11 whom?

14

21

2

5

8

- 12 A. Angel Valley. By Michael and Amayra
- 13 Hamilton.
 - **Q.** And during the time that you were at
- 15 Angel Valley then from -- living at Angel Valley
- 16 from 2008 through 2009, did you assist with other
- 17 sweat lodge events?
- 18 A. Yes, I did.
- **19 Q.** Let's talk about the first sweat lodge
- 20 that you assisted. You said that it was in 2007?
 - A. That's correct.
- 22 Q. And who were you taking direction from?
- 23 A. Gary -- Michael, Amayra and Gary.
- **Q.** Do you recall how many sweat lodge events
- 25 you assisted with in 2007?

- jury just generally are there two parts to a sweat
- 2 lodge?
- 3 A. Well, yeah. There is two parts. We have
- 4 the kiva, the wooden structure that stays in place
- 5 all the time. We -- it was built there and it was
- 6 standing there. That's a freestanding wood
- 7 structure.
 - Then we take the coverings. When they're going to use the sweat lodge or have a sweat lodge,
- 10 we take the coverings and cover up the kiva.
- Q. What happens when a sweat lodge is over?What do you do with the coverings?
- A. We take the -- we take all the tarps off and take the blankets off and let them dry and then fold them up and put them back in the pump house.
- **Q.** During the time -- let's tell the jury,
- 17 when was it that you left Angel Valley?
- 18 A. I left living there?
- **19 Q.** Yes.
- 20 A. It was November of '09.
- 21 Q. And there was a period you said at the
- 22 end of December of 2008 you stopped working there?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- **Q.** You remained on the property?
- 25 A. Well, I was amongst Angel Valley

- 1 A. Three or four.
 - Q. Had you ever done a sweat lodge before?
 - 3 A. Never even seen a sweat lodge before.
 - 4 Q. Never been in one?
 - A. Never been in one. No.
 - **Q.** Did you know what they were?
 - 7 A. Had no idea.
 - Q. Who did you learn, then, from to do what
 - 9 you had to do?
 - 10 A. Well, from Gary, the general manager.
 - 11 That's the person we had most contact with.
 - **12 Q.** The first sweat lodge that you assisted
 - 13 in 2007, what was your role?
 - 14 A. I assisted being the fire keeper, and I
 - 15 put the lodge together. I put the blankets and the
 - 16 tarps on top of the lodge.
 - 17 Q. Okay. And the next sweat lodge that you
 - 18 did in 2007, do you recall what your duties were?
 - 19 A. The same thing. I covered the lodge, and
 - 20 then I assisted with the -- the fire keeper, as a
 - 21 fire keeper.
 - **Q.** Do you believe you did more sweat lodges
 - 23 in 2007?
 - 24 A. As?
 - **Q.** Assisted in some way.

102

your duties the same?

4

8

11

14

17

18

19

25

1

3

8

A. Yes, they were.

5 Q. And with respect to all three or four, 6 did you participate in putting the coverings on the

7 kiva and then taking the coverings off later?

> Α. That's correct.

9 Q. And each time tell the jury where it was 10 that you found the coverings.

> Α. The coverings were in the pump house.

12 Q. And then each time who was it that

13 returned the coverings to their place?

Α. Mv wife and I.

Q. 15 And each time, tell the jury where it is 16 you returned the coverings?

> Α. To the same pump house right there.

Throughout 2007 did you ever store those coverings in any other place?

A. 20 No.

Q. And throughout 2007 when you went to get 21 22 the coverings to cover a sweat lodge for an event, 23 did you ever have to find coverings from any other 24 place?

> A. Sometimes we had to search around for

tarps, but all the blankets were always right

2 there.

Q.

Okay.

4 Α. Cause we'd use the tarps everywhere.

5 Q. Because what?

We'd use tarps everywhere. 6 Α.

7 Q. At the property?

> Α. Yes.

9 To your knowledge, the various tarps that

10 were used at Angel Valley -- where were they

11 stored?

12 MR. LI: Objection. Lack of foundation.

13 MS. POLK: I can rephrase the question, Your

14 Honor.

15

20

21

THE COURT: Thank you.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Do you know, 16

17 Mr. Hamilton (sic) -- you mentioned tarps were used

around Angel Valley. Do you know where the various 18

19 tarps were stored?

> Α. Yes.

> > Q. And how do you know?

22 A. Because I had to go get them.

23 And where is it that you would get tarps

24 from when you needed them for various events?

25 Mostly in the pump house. 19 Tell the jury where you found the Q.

20 coverings for Mr. Ray's sweat lodge in 2009.

21 Α. In the pump house where we kept all the 22 other ones.

And we'll talk later about what happened Q. to the coverings after that event.

Were you present in 2007 for a sweat

23

24

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 105 to 108 of 281

Α.

Q.

we were putting it in the same spot. He told us

and where to start our first few sticks.

Who all was involved in building this kiva?

and another gentleman named Brian.

Q. Was Gary Palisch there?

and I'm going to put up on the overhead

Exhibit 242. What's the first thing you did to

What kind of sticks are those?

start building the kiva for the sweat lodge?

how many sticks to gather and where to put the door

I was, my wife was, a lady named Anita

He wasn't there helping us build it. No.

Okay. Tell the jury, then, beginning --

Well, we had to go collect the sticks.

Q. And you're saying "us," "he taught us."

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27 of 71 sheets

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

A.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

constructed the new kıva?

So it was summertime.

That's correct.

Yes, there was.

What was your role?

Yes, I did.

In 2008 was a new kiva constructed?

I assisted building the new kiva.

What happened to the old kıva?

We tore it down and burned it.

it was summertime because we were in the water

collecting sticks, and the water was nice and warm.

Do you recall what month it was that you

Well, not exactly the month. But I know

Did you have a role in that?

28 of 71 sheets

- Α. Those are willow sticks. 1
- 2 Q. Where did you get them from?
- From the creek right around the property. 3 Α.
- 4 Q. Will you show the jury -- do you see the creek on this? 5
- 6 Α. Well, no. But you can tell -- well, I 7 can tell because I know where it is. It's back 8 here. It runs around here and goes around. Well, actually, we went down further. We really searched
- 9 10 for a lot of trees.
- Q. I'm going to put back up on the overhead 11 12 Exhibit 140. Does this show the creek you're 13 referring to?
 - Α. That's correct. And most of the willows came from this area here.
 - Q. Does the willow grow in the water?
- 17 Α. Yeah. Right in the water and right next to it. 18
- Q. How do you cut it down? 19
- 20 Α. With a machete.
- Q. And then what do you with the willow? 21
- 22 Α. We get a whole bunch of them. We tie 23 them together. We let them sit in the creek until 24 we've got enough sticks. And then we put them in 25
 - the back of my truck and brought them to this
- location here. 1
- 2 Q. This was your first time doing this?
- 3 Α. Yes.
- Q. 4 How did you know how many sticks you
- needed? 5

14

15

16

- 6 Α. Singing Bear told us.
- 7 Q. How did you get the sticks from what 8 appears to be straight to what appears to be a bent
- 9 position?

10

11

12

13

14

21

24

25

sweat lodge.

- Well, we would take an aluminum pipe and pound it into the ground at each one of these spots where we put a stick. And we'd get the stick in there, and we would bend it over and tie it to the next one.
- 15 Q. Was there anything that you did for the hole that the sticks were going in? 16
- 17 Well, every hole got an offering and a blessing from each one of us. So when we built the 18 19 sweat lodge, every time we dug a hole, we put a 20 little offering. I think it was some sage and tobacco, corn meal and something else. I can't 22 remember. And each one of us would say a prayer for the sweat lodge and for good intentions for the 23
 - Q. Do you recall how many holes you dug and

1 did that for?

6

7

8

9

- 2 Α. Oh, jeez. 30 maybe or more. I don't remember off hand. No.
- 4 Q. What did you use to tie the sticks? How 5 did you get the sticks to stay together?
 - We would use the natural willow leaf branches, the really thin ones and some twine, some hemp twine.
 - Q. Where did you get that from?
- 10 We got the -- the willow from the creek, 11 and the twine came from the Hamiltons somewhere.
- 12 I'm not sure where we got that.
- 13 Will you tell the jury who are the people
- 14 we see in the photograph. 15 The gentleman with the hat there is
- 16 Brian. He was a friends of Singing Bear's. And he 17 had built sweat lodges before, so he was kind of in
- 18 the lead. The girl in the purple shirt is Anita.
- 19 She was a volunteer out there at the time. And I'm 20 standing there with the other hat on.
- 21 Q. I'm going to put on the overhead
- Exhibit 243. If you will tell the jury what's
- 23 occurring in this photograph.
 - A. The same thing. It looks like he's just
 - putting a stick into the ground and making sure
- 110

24

- it's secure and getting it bent over. You kind of
- had to put your legs around it to bend it so it
- wouldn't break. And it looks like he's putting
- some pressure on that. We're getting ready to tie
- 5 it. Maybe Anita is tying it right there.
- 6 I'm going to put up Exhibit 244. What is
- 7 that?

8

- Α. That's the finished kiva.
- 9 How long did it take you -- once you 10 started actually putting the sticks together, how 11 long did that process take?
- 12 Α. About three and a half, four days.
- 13 Q. And what event was coming up in 2008 that 14 you were getting ready for?
 - Α. The James Ray sweat lodge.
- 16 How long once this kiva was
- 17 constructed -- let me ask you this: What did you 18 do next with respect to building the sweat lodge?
- 19 Well, after we got to that, the finished 20 sweat lodge, the finished kiva, then David Singing
- Bear came back out and placed four sticks around
- 22 the sweat lodge and did a prayer to help bless the 23
 - whole area.
- 24 Q. Four sticks around the outside or the
- 25 inside?

- A. Well, they're on the outside of the sweat lodge. So one was, like, right here. And one was over here. One was behind it. And then one was over here with different colored rags on it. I
- 5 didn't quite understand what it all meant, but he6 did.
- Q. In fact. I'm going to put up on theoverhead Exhibit 246. Does that show the stickwith the rags you were just referring to?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. And then going back to Exhibit 244,
- 12 what's the next stage to get the sweat lodge ready
- 13 for use?

25

8

19

- 14 A. We start covering it with blankets.
 - Q. And, again, the blankets came from where?
- 16 A. The pump house.
- 17 Q. How did you know how to cover it?
- 18 A. Well, the very first time that we did a
 19 sweat lodge, we got a memo from Michael Hamilton
 20 through Gary that told us exactly how to put it
- 21 together.
- **Q.** If you will describe for the jury, then,
- 23 generally, what sort of coverings did you put on
- 24 the sweat lodge?
 - A. There was a whole bunch of moving
 - blankets and old comforters and all that kind -- of
- 2 electric blankets. And we would cover the kiva
- 3 with all the blankets first.
- **Q.** And then once you had it covered with
- 5 blankets, what did you do?
- 6 A. Then we would cover it with the tarps.
- **Q.** What sort of tarps were there?
 - A. They're just blue tarps from Home Depot.
- 9 Q. Did any of the tarps -- could you see any
- 10 of the tarps from the inside of the sweat lodge?
- 11 A. Well, no. No. You couldn't see the 12 tarps from the inside of the sweat lodge.
- 13 Q. And what was in between the tarps and the
- 14 kiva or the twigs, the sticks?
 15 A. Well, we put all the blankets and the
 16 moving blankets and all that on first. And then
- moving blankets and all that on first. And then the tarps would go over the top of that to hold all
- 18 the moisture and everything in.
 - Q. And did something go on top of the tarps?
- A. At first we weren't using this big rubber thing, but after, like, the third sweat lodge I
- 22 did, Michael came down and said -- you know --
- 23 we've got this big rubber deal that goes over the
- 24 top of the whole sweat lodge to seal it. So we
- 25 started using that too.

- Q. Did that rubber thing or rubber deal have
- 2 a name?

1

3

5

9

12

14

- A. The rubber deal.
- **Q.** "The rubber deal" is what you called it?
 - A. The heavy rubber deal.
- **Q.** I'm going to put up on the overhead
- **7** Exhibit 7. Does that show this rubber thing that
- 8 you're describing?
 - A. Yes, it does.
- 10 Q. Describe for the jury, first of all, what
- 11 color is it?
 - A. It's brownish.
- 13 Q. And how big is it?
 - A. It's huge. It covered that whole sweat
- 15 lodge. It was really heavy. Except for just a
- 16 little piece on the back, it would cover the whole
- 17 thing.
- **Q.** Where was this rubber deal stored?
- 19 A. It was --
- 20 MR. LI: Objection. Lack of foundation.
- 21 Timing.
- 22 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 23 Q. BY MS. POLK: I'm sorry. Do you know
- 24 where the rubber deal was stored?
- 25 A. It was in the pump house.

116

- 1 MR. LI: Move to strike. We need a time
- 2 frame.

114

- 3 THE COURT: Sustained.
- **Q.** BY MS. POLK: When was the first time,
- 5 the first year, that you saw the rubber cover?
- 6 A. Well, I saw it in there the very first
- 7 time we did it, but I didn't know what it was. And
- it was so heavy I didn't want to move it. We -- we
- 9 used it -- we started using it in '08, I think it
- 10 was.

- Q. Are you sure?
- 12 A. As sure as I can be right now. I'm
- 13 really bad with times.
- 14 Q. Is it possible you used it in 2007 as
- 15 well?
- 16 MR. LI: Objection. Leading. Speculation.
- 17 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 18 You may answer that.
- 19 THE WITNESS: I don't think we used it in
- 20 2007. I know we didn't use it for the James Ray
- 21 sweat lodge.
- 22 Q. BY MS. POLK: You know you did not use
- **23** it?
- 24 A. We did not. No.
 - **Q.** In 2007?

23 MR. LI: Move to strike. 24 Q. You have no perso

think they are.

lodge ceremony; correct?

19

20

21

22

31 of 71 sheets

Q. You have no personal knowledge?

the coverings are exactly the same for every sweat

A. I have no personal knowledge. But I

25 A. No personal knowledge.

Page 121 to 124 of 281

19

20

22

23

24

house.

Α.

Q.

Q. So you do not have personal knowledge

You don't have personal knowledge whether

whether the tarps and blankets were in the pump

they were in there February of 2009; correct?

house in January 2009; correct?

Correct.

Q. You have no idea for those 270 days you

were not in the pump house how these tarps and

blankets were being maintained; correct?

23

24

25

Q. Mr. Mercer, I'm going to show you

Exhibits 795, 796 and 797. And this is just a yes

or no question. Do you recognize these?

- 1 A. Yes, I do.
- 2 Q. And how is it that you recognize them?
- A. That is the pump house that we stored all the blankets in.
- 5 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I move for the
- 6 admission of 795, 796 and 797.
- 7 MR. LI: Your Honor, I just don't have -- if I
- 8 could just look.
- 9 THE COURT: Of course.
- **10** Mr. Li?
- 11 MR. LI: No objection, Your Honor.
- 12 THE COURT: Those three exhibits -- 795, -96,
- 13 and -97 -- are admitted.
 - (Exhibits 795 through 797 admitted.)
- **Q.** BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put up 795.
- 16 Can you tell the jury what that is.
- 17 A. That is the water pump house.
- 18 Q. Was that pump house on the property when
- 19 you got there?

14

21

24

1

- 20 A. That is correct.
 - Q. And when you left it in 2009, was that
- 22 pump house still there?
- 23 A. Yes.
 - Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 25 Exhibit 796. Tell the jury what that is.
 - A. That's the same pump house.
- **Q.** Is that the door?
- 3 A. Yes, it is.
- 4 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I move for the
- 5 admission of exhibits --
- 6 THE COURT: Those three are admitted.
- 7 Q. BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put up on the
- 8 overhead Exhibit 797. Understanding that this
- 9 photograph was taken, Mr. Mercer, in 2011 after you
- 10 left, do you recognize what it is?
- 11 A. Yes, I do is. It's a pump house.
- 12 Q. Is that the interior?
- 13 A. Yeah. That's the inside of the pump
- 14 house.
- **Q.** You've testified that from 2007 to 2009
- 16 you always stored and retrieved the coverings and
- 17 the rubber deal from the pump house. I'd like you
- 18 to describe for the jury how they were stored
- 19 inside the pump house.
- 20 A. Well, you can see the table behind --
- 21 behind the two pressure tanks there. That's where
- 22 all the blankets would be piled on top of. So we
- 23 would pile them about that high because we had a
- 24 lot of blankets. And then the tarps and the big
- 25 rubber deal was on the floor on each side of this
- 25 rudder dear was on the floor on each side of this

- because we still needed to get in to get to the
- pump. So we had it on the side.
- **Q.** I asked you earlier about the use of
- 4 chemicals on the property. Did you ever put any
- 5 chemicals in the pump house where the coverings
- 6 were stored?

8

12

- 7 A. I did not.
 - **Q.** Did you ever see anything in the pump
- 9 house that you believed could be chemicals?
- 10 A. I saw something that looked like rat 11 poisoning, or I assumed it was rat poisoning.
 - Q. Describe for the jury, first of all,
- 13 where you saw it.
- 14 A. Over here there was a little hole where
- 15 electricity came in. And it was big enough where a
- 16 mouse or a rat could come in. On this side there
- 17 was also another hole. So it was -- it was around
- 18 the hole.
- **Q.** And describe for the jury what the
- 20 substance is that you saw -- just tell them what it
- 21 looked like.
- 22 A. As far as I remember, it was like
- 23 granules, like blue and white sand, little bit
- 24 bigger.
- 25 Q. Did you recognize it to be a product used
 - Q. Did you recognize it to be a product us
- 1 to kill mice?

5

6

11

15

20

21

23

- 2 A. You know, I saw something on the floor,
- and I assumed it was rat poison. But I -- I don't
- 4 know myself if it was actually rat poison or not.
 - Q. And did you ever put it there?
 - A. No.
- **Q.** Do you recall whether it was the first
- 8 time you saw it there?
- 9 A. I think it was the first time we went in
- 10 there in '07.
 - **Q**. 2007?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Did you ever notice any change to it
- 14 between 2007 to 2009?
 - A. Not that I can recall.
- **Q.** Did you ever notice any change in the
- 17 amount?
- 18 MR. LI: Objection. Asked and answered.
- 19 THE COURT: Overruled.
 - If you can answer that.
 - THE WITNESS: Not that I can recall.
- 22 Q. BY MS. POLK: And do you have an
 - observation as to how fresh it was when you saw
- 24 it --
- 25 MR. LI: Objection.

sweat lodge.

24

25

The -- I see two sticks with flags, it

appears to be. Is that correct?

We put them on the inside and the outside of the

- 1 Q. Do they stay up when the sweat lodge is 2 not in use?
- 2 not in use?3 A. Yes, they do.
- Q. When the sweat lodge in not in use, thentell the jury what comes down.
- A. The blankets. All the blankets and the tarps. The big rubber deal comes off. And we lay them out in the ground so they'll dry and then fold them up and put them in the pump house.
- 10 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead11 Exhibit 247. Do you recognize that?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.

- 13 Q. I want to ask you specifically about what14 we see here. What is that?
- 15 A. That's the door.
- **Q.** Tell the jury how you make the door.
- 18 bags that I tie to a stick. And then we take two
 19 ropes to put over the top of the sweat lodge so it
 20 won't fall down, to get it -- to get it to stay

Well, I have a couple of big sleeping

- 21 there. And then the sleeping bags go over the door $\frac{1}{2}$
- 22 to block out any sunlight.
- **Q.** How do you attach the door to the rest of the sweat lodge?
- 25 A. It's not attached. It's just sitting on
 - top. See the two ropes here that go across the
- 2 back? They're attached to rocks on the other side
- 3 so the whole thing won't side down in front of us.
- 4 But it's attached to this long stick there, and
- 5 then it just hangs.
- Q. Okay. And these sleeping bags that wereused to make the door -- where did you store them
- 8 in between uses?
- 9 A. In the sweat lodge.
- 10 Q. This colorful stuff around here -- what
- 11 is that?
- A. That's part of the door. So when we
 built the sweat lodge, they Brian wrapped the
 door with willow leaves, and then he put some other
 string on it. I can't remember what kind. I think
 this colorful stuff there might be just part of the
- blankets sticking out.
 But there was something wrapped around
- the door -- string that would wrap around. And it
 was like another prayer bead like the one that went
 up in the inside.
- MS. POLK: Your Honor, counsel has agreed to admit Exhibits 241, 239 and 238.
- 24 THE COURT: The numbers again, please?
- **25** MS. POLK: 238, 239, 241.

- THE COURT: Those exhibits are admitted.
- (Exhibits 238, 239 and 241 admitted.)
- **Q.** BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put up on the
- 4 overhead Exhibit 238, which is from May of 2009, I
- belive.

1

2

6

9

- Do you recognize that?
- 7 A. Yeah. That looks like a sweat lodge that 8 was already done.
 - Q. And what do you mean "already done"?
- 10 A. Well, that the rocks have been burnt up
- and somebody had already done a sweat lodge in it.That's probably the next day.
- 13 Q. When you say the rocks have already --
- 14 show the jury specifically, for example, what this
- **15** is
- 16 A. Well, that's the fire pit that we heat
- 17 the rocks in. And we just get them as hot as we
- 18 can before they go into the sweat lodge. And all
- 19 these other rocks around the property, around the
- 20 sweat lodge, are probably the rocks that were in
- 21 that hole, and we took them out that morning.
- 22 Q. Okay. I'm going to put up on the
- 23 overhead Exhibit 239, which is a close up. Again,
- 24 If you can just tell the jury, then, for example,
- 25 what kind of material that would be right there.
 - 140
- 1 A. That's probably one of the tarps and the 2 blankets there.
- **Q.** Do you think it's a tarp if it's on the
- 4 inside?
 - A. Well, see looks more like a blanket to
- 6 me.

5

14

20

21

23

- **7** Q. Okay. What did you start to say?
- 8 A. Well -- you know -- you cover the thing
- 9 with the blankets first. So then you put the tarps
- 10 on top of it. And sometimes -- you know --
- 11 especially around the door something could be
- 12 sticking out. You know, a piece of the tarp or
- 13 something.
 - Q. And I want to put up on the overhead 241.
- 15 Do you recognize that?
- 16 A. Yes. That's the inside.
- 17 Q. You've talked about blue moving blankets.
- 18 Do you see them in this photograph?
- 19 A. Yes.
 - **Q.** Show the jury where they are.
 - A. They're here and they're here. I see
- 22 some there and one there and one here and one here.
 - Q. Those are blankets?
- 24 A. Yeah. Those are moving blankets. We
- 25 have some gray ones too. Kind of the same.

- 1 Q. What is a moving blanket?
 - A. I guess a moving blanket is one of those blankets you get from, like, Budget or something when you rent a truck to move your house and wrap your furniture and stuff with.
- Q. How many layers of blankets do you put onthe sweat lodge before you put the tarps?
 - A. Oh, probably two. In some places there would be three or four in layers. But it just all depends on how well it blocked out the sun.
- Q. When you put the coverings on your kiva
 for each sweat lodge, do you always put them in the
 exactly the same order?
- 14 A. Oh, no.
- Q. And when you put the tarps on top of theblankets, do you always put the tarps in exactlythe same order?
- 18 A. No.

3

8

9

10

1

2

- 19 Q. What are you trying to do with the20 blankets and tarps in terms of order?
- A. It's just to make sure that we block out any light or any air that would be coming in and
- 22 any light or any air that would be coming in and
 23 out of the sweat lodge.
 24 Q. And once you started using the rubber
- Q. And once you started using the rubberdeal, does that just go on one way?

142

1

2

5

7

15

- A. Yes. Because there is a door cut in it.

 So we have to put it on the same way every time.
- Q. You testified earlier about drying out
 the blankets and the sleeping bags after a sweat
 lodge.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Why do you do that?
- 8 A. Because when they throw the water on the 9 rocks, there is so much steam made that they get 10 wet.
- Q. For the sweat lodges that you assisted in2007, did you need to dry out the blankets aftereach sweat lodge?
- 14 A. Sure.
- **Q.** And for 2008 did you need to dry out the
- 16 blankets for each sweat lodge?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. How about for 2009?
- 19 A. Yes.

18

- **Q.** How did you dry out the blankets?
- A. We put the tarps on the ground and put the blankets on top of them.
- **Q.** And about how long did it take to dry out
- 24 the blankets?
- 25 A. A few hours. Depended on what time of

1 the year it was.

141

- **Q.** In conducting -- during the time that you
- 3 participated in assisting with sweat lodge
- 4 ceremonies performed at Angel Valley, did you ever
- 5 have the opportunity to touch the rubber -- during
- 6 the time that the rubber deal was used, did you
- 7 ever have an opportunity to touch it during a
- 8 ceremony?

9

- A. Sure.
- 10 Q. And was it ever hot?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. And did you ever have an opportunity to
- 13 touch the tarps during your time at Angel Valley
- 14 during a sweat lodge ceremony?
- A. Well, the first couple sweat lodges wedid because we didn't use the big rubber deal. But
- 17 yes.
- **Q.** And did the tarps ever get hot?
- 19 A. No.
- Q. Let's go through, Mr. Mercer, the sweatlodge ceremony itself and have you explain to the
- 22 jury what you did to assist the ceremony.
- 23 First of all, once the -- I'm going to
- 24 put up on the overhead Exhibit 145. That's already
- 25 admitted into evidence.
 - Do you recognize that?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- **Q.** And are you in that picture?
- 4 A. I think I'm drinking water right there.
 - Q. Do you recognize this to be the --
- 6 Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony in October of 2009?
 - A. I couldn't tell you.
- 8 Well, yeah, because we put the tarps on
- 9 the ground there for people to lay on.10 Q. Okay. And I just want to talk about the
- 11 ceremony. And if you can refer to that picture to
- 12 help talk about the ceremony, then you can.
- 13 Let's talk about 2007. You had testified
- 14 that your role was an assistant fire keeper?
 - A. That's correct.
- 16 Q. Who did you assist?
- 17 A. Gary Palisch.
- **18 Q.** Tell the jury what a fire keeper does for
- 19 the ceremony.
- 20 A. A fire keeper -- the fire keeper holds
- 21 the energy of the fire. So what we do is we heat
- 22 the rocks. We -- before we even heat the rocks or
- 23 build a fire, we bless the rocks and give them an
- 24 offering and do a prayer for them because we know
- 5 they're going into the sweat lodge. We want them

2

14

15

16

17

18

2

5

9

- 1 to be energetically dear as possible.
 - We heat the rocks. We make sure that they're always covered by fire and sticks, that they're never exposed to the air so they can get as hot as possible.
- 6 Q. I'm going to put it back up on the 7 overhead Exhibit 238 since you're talking about 8 heating the rocks. Do you see the type of rock 9 used in this photograph?
- 10 Α. That's correct. The rocks that we use 11 for the sweat lodge are these here and the ones in 12 the pit.

And then after we're done with the sweat lodge, we never use the same rocks twice. So we always we have -- a little wall starting building up with the used rocks.

- Q. Where do you get those rocks from?
- Α. They're laying around on the property.
- 19 Q. Do you know what kind of rocks they are?
- 20 Α. They're lava rocks.
 - Q. Whereabouts on the property do you find
- 22 them?

2

3

4

5

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

1

2

6

7

8

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. 23 All over.
 - Q. Do you find them down in the creek area?
- 25 Α. Yeah. That's, basically, where we go.

146

- The rest of it is more manicured. So they would be done down by the creek.
- 3 You talked about this wall over here of 4 the used rocks. When did you start building that 5 wall?
 - Well, the wall was already started building before we even got there. So we just kept adding to it.
- 9 I'm going to put back on the overhead, then, Exhibit 145. You talked about heating the 10 11 rocks in a fire. Does this exhibit show the fire 12 that you heated the rocks in for Mr. Ray's sweat
- 13 lodge in 2009?
- - Α. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Tell the jury what you are concerned with 16 in heating the rocks.
 - That they get as hot as possible. We heat them up so they're glowing red if we can.
 - How do you get them as hot as possible?
 - We build a big fire over the top of them. Make sure there is no rock exposed to the air. And we make sure that there is always a fire around it.
- 23 How much time prior to the beginning of a 24 sweat lodge ceremony do you start heating your
- 25 rocks?

- A. Usually two hours.
- You talked about in 2007 your role as
- assistant fire keeper. What did you do, then, as
- 4 assistant fire keeper?
- 5 A. I pretty much tended the fire. And when 6 they called for rocks, we'd open up the fire and 7 pull the rocks out and bring them to the door, hand 8 them to the person inside the door.

9 And then after we got all the rocks in, 10 we would cover the all the rocks back up with new 11 wood and make sure that they were burning properly.

- 12 What's the difference, then, between what 13 the fire keeper does and the assistant fire keep?
 - Well, the fire keeper is actually somebody that needs to be right at the door the whole time. So Gary was actually the official fire keeper, the person who stays on the outside. But he needs help, so I was helping him.
- 19 Q. Okay. In 2008 -- at some point did you 20 move from assistant fire keeper to a different role 21 with respect to the sweat lodges that you assisted 22 at Angel Valley between 2007 and 2009?
- 23 MR. LI: I'd ask this picture be taken down. 24 This is 2009, October, and we're talking about
- 25 other sweat lodges.

148

- 1 MS. POLK: I can take it down, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Okay.
- 3 THE WITNESS: After Gary Palisch left, then I
- 4 took over as the fire keeper.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: And when was that?
- 6 Α. December of '08.
- 7 Q. How many sweat lodges after Gary Palisch
- 8 left were you the fire keeper for?
 - Α. Two.
- 10 Q. They were the May and October of 2009?
- 11 Α. That's correct.
- 12 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 13 Exhibit 145, understanding that it's the October
- 14 of 2009, Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony. Because I 15 want to direct your testimony to, again, the fire.
- 16 Generally speaking, where would you find
- 17 the wood to heat your rocks?
- 18 Α. Generally speaking, there was just - in 19 this direction there was a big wood pile. And a 20 lot of it was cut out of there. It would be 21 stacked ready for us to use.
- 22 Q. Do you know where the wood from -- that 23 was in the wood pile came from?
 - Yeah. From another wood pile just about a hundred yards over from the sweat lodge.

24

7

8

9

17

21

22

23

1

2

4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

150

152

- Q. Do you know who cut the first wood pile,the one that was hundred yards away?
- 3 A. Well, no. That wasn't cut wood. That
 - was all old construction wood.

 Q. Now, specifically talking about 2009,
 - then, where was the pile of construction wood?

 A. The pile of construction wood was still the same spot, but it was a lot smaller because they cut a whole bunch of it for us to use for the
- 9 they cut a whole bunch of it fo10 sweat lodge.

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

24

25

1

17

- **Q.** When did you first become aware -- in your experience at Angel Valley, when were you first aware of a pile of construction wood that was about hundred yards away from the sweat lodge?
 - A. The day that I went there the first time.
- Q. During the time that you did sweatlodges, where did you get the wood from for yourfire?
 - A. Mostly around the creek. There was a big pile of dead wood right on the other side, right over here where we would cut things up.
- Q. Did you ever use wood from theconstruction pile of wood to build fires?
 - A. Sometimes. Yes.
 - Q. Tell the jury when it is, if you recall.

A. In '08, I think it was, we started using

- that stuff because we were cleaning up the property
 and wanted to get rid of some of that wood. So we
 started cutting that up.
- Q. For Mr. Ray's ceremony in October
 of 2009, tell the jury where you got the wood from
 to heat your rocks.
- 8 A. Well, it was sitting just right by the 9 fire there because it had already been cut and 10 stacked for us.
- 11 Q. Was it construction wood?
- 12 A. As far as I know, it looked the same as 13 the construction wood that was a hundred yards 14 away.
- Q. And you had used construction wood forpast sweat lodges?
 - MR. LI: Objection. Leading.
- 18 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 19 Q. BY MS. POLK: Did you use construction20 wood prior to October of 2009 to heat your rocks?
- 21 MR. LI: Objection. Vague. How much
- 22 construction wood. That's not his testimony.
- 23 In 2009, October, it was all construction wood.
- 24 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I'll get there. This
- 25 is yes or no.

- 1 THE COURT: Ms. Polk, I'm going to sustain as 2 to form.
 - Go ahead and ask a question.
- Q. BY MS. POLK: For the sweat lodge thatyou did in May of 2009, where did you get the woodfrom to heat your fire?
 - A. In 2009 it was all stacked for us just on the other side of this fire pit.
 - Q. For both --
- MR. LI: It's not clear what the witness istestifying about. I'd move to strike.
- 12 I think we need to delineate different13 times and identify what wood we're talking about.
- MS. POLK: And, Your Honor, that's what I'mattempting to do.
- 16 THE COURT: Excuse me. Overruled.

You may continue, Ms. Polk.

- Q. BY MS. POLK: I'm sorry. The answer tothe question about where the wood came to heat therocks for the ceremony in May of 2009 was what?
 - A. It was stacked -- it was cut and stacked, waiting for us just on the other side of the fire there where we can't see.
- **Q.** Did you use any wood from the creek for your May of 2009 fire?

- Q. And for your October of 2009 fire, did
- 3 you use any wood from the creek?

No, we did not.

Α.

- A. Yeah. I think so.
- **Q.** What do you recail?
- 6 A. Well -- you know -- it was always a
- 7 mixture of wood usually. The first few sweat
- 8 lodges we did was all wood around the creek, so
- 9 natural wood. And after we started cleaning up and
- wanted to get rid of some of the stuff around theproperty, then we started cutting up that wood.
- Q. And do you recall when it was that youstarted using some of the wood from the property --
- 14 the construction wood?
 - A. Sometime in '08.
 - **Q.** Mr. Mercer, when you heat those rocks, then, will you explain to the jury, for you how close are you getting to that fire?
 - A. Oh. I'm almost in the fire. Because when they call for rocks -- you know -- all the rocks are covered by the fire and the sticks. So you got to get in there and open it up, make a spot where there isn't any fire so you can get in and get the rocks. We use a little extension on

shovels and stuff so we wouldn't get too hot. But,

- yeah. I've been burned before.
- Q. For what period of time -- let's talk
 about October 2009. For what period of time was
 your exposure to that fire, as you've just

described?

5

12

13

14

15

22

23

24

25

1

8

- A. Well, it would probably take two or three
 minutes to get enough rocks out. It depends on how
 many they call for. If they only call for a
 couple, you can just grab those and go. But if we
 had to get ten or more, then it would take a few
 minutes to get them all out.
 - Q. And in terms of the entire sweat lodge ceremony, then, can you estimate for the jury how many times -- how many minutes you're exposed that closely to the fire.
- A. I would say approximately at least a half
 and hour. Right on top of it kind of inside the
 fire almost.
- Q. When you're not right on top of itgetting a rock out, what were you doing withrespect to the fire?
 - A. Making sure that it was covered up.

 Making sure that no rocks were exposed and
 everything was burning around it. I'd throw more
 wood on it and step back so I wouldn't be so hot.

Q. In October of 2009 for Mr. Ray's sweat

2 lodge ceremony, did you ever get sick after being

3 close to that fire?

4 A. No.

- Q. And in May of 2009 did you ever get sick
 after being close to the fire you used then to heat
 the rocks?
- r the rocks
- 9 Q. And for the sweat lodge ceremony that you 10 did in 2008, did you ever get sick after your
- and in 2000, and you over got block area, your
- 11 exposure to the fire that was used to heat the
- 12 rocks?
- 13 A. No, I didn't.

A. No.

- Q. For the sweat lodge ceremony you did in2007, did you ever get sick after your exposure to
- 16 the fire used to heat the rocks?
- 17 A. No.
- MS. POLK: Your Honor, I see that it's noon.
- 19 Would you like me to stop?
- 20 THE COURT: Yes. Thank you, Ms. Polk.
- 21 Ladies and gentlemen, we will take the
- 22 noon recess at this time. Please remember the
- **23** admonition, of course.
- 24 And then I also want to tell Mr. Mercer
- 25 to please follow -- you must follow the rule of

- exclusion of witnesses, which has been invoked in
- this case. You're nodding your head, so I think
- 3 you understand.

5

9

14

24

1

7

8

154

- 4 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
 - THE COURT: It's been explained. It means you
- 6 can't communicate with any other witness about your
- 7 the case or your testimony until the trial is
- 8 completely over.
 - THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 10 THE COURT: It's a good idea not to
- 11 communicate with anyone else until the case is
- 12 over. However, you can talk to the lawyers as long
- 13 as other witnesses are not present.
 - Do vou understand?
- 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. Can I have lunch with my
- 16 wife?
- 17 THE COURT: You just cannot discuss your case18 or your testimony in any way with any other witness
- 19 or communicate with somebody that might get
- 20 information that you've testified about to someone.
- 21 So nothing about the case or the people involved in
- 22 it. Anything at all related to the case, you
- 23 cannot talk about that with other witnesses.
 - THE WITNESS: I understand.
- 25 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

We will be in recess.

2 (Recess.)

- 3 THE COURT: The record will show the presence
- 4 of the defendant, Mr. Ray; the attorneys, the jury.
- 5 The witness, Mr. Mercer, has returned to the stand
- 6 having previously been sworn.
 - Ms. Polk.
 - MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **9 Q.** Good afternoon, Mr. Mercer.
- 10 A. Hello. How are you?
- 11 Q. Good. When we stopped for lunch, we were
- 12 just beginning to speak about the sweat lodge
- 13 ceremony itself. You have testified about the role
- 14 of the fire keeper and the assistant fire keeper.
- 15 Will you tell the jury what other functions are
- 16 performed to make a sweat lodge ceremony happen.
- 17 A. Well, usually the fire keeper, the
- 18 official fire keeper, is usually a door keepe
- 18 official fire keeper, is usually a door keeper
- 19 also. And that's why he has assistants working
- 20 with him to take care of the fire. Because the one
- 21 that's in charge is in charge of the door -- the
- 22 outside of the door of the sweat lodge.
- So that person must be vigilant aboutwhat's going on in the sweat lodge so when they
- 25 want the door open or they need something for the

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

sweat lodge inside, that he will be there right there to take care of the things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

10

11

17

18

19

22

Q. What other assistants are there normally, in your experience?

A. Well, there is usually a couple people taking care of the fire, one person at the door. And then usually we had another person that would -- we would switch off. Depends on how many people we had. Brush off the rocks when we bring them in. They'd be in the hot fire. We get all the ash and everything off of them before they could go into the sweat lodge.

Q. What about the water? Who gets water for the ceremony?

Α. We do. We get the water. There is buckets out there we wash out. And then there is a hose that we run from a spigot that's about hundred yards away. And we fill up the water from the well.

Q. And who runs the ceremony itself?

Α. The person who is inside the sweat lodge. The "pourer," I guess I call him. He's the one that's in charge with what's going on with the sweat lodge.

Q. Have you ever run a sweat lodge ceremony?

158

Α. No.

2 Q. In talking about 2007, the sweat lodge 3 ceremonies that you assisted, you've already 4 testified that your role was as an assistant for

5 those ceremonies? 6

Α. That's correct.

7 Q. Do you recall for the first ceremony that 8 you assisted, who was the pourer, the person inside 9 running the ceremony itself?

A. Well, the very first one was James Ray.

Q. Do you recall what month that was?

12 It was in the summer, I remember, because 13 it was really warm. But I can't tell you what 14 month it was.

15 Okay. Do you recall the second sweat 16 lodge ceremony that you had a role at in 2007?

> Α. Yeah.

Q. Do you recall who the pourer was or the person who was inside running the ceremony?

20 Α. I can't remember his name. No. I don't 21 remember who was in there at that time.

> Q. What names do you recall, Mr. Mercer?

23 I remember Healing Wolf and David Singing

24 Bear and then James Ray and -- well, the Agave 25 group. But I don't know who was the one that was 1 in charge of that.

And then there was another guy that had a real Indian name. I can't remember him. But I did his sweat lodge too.

Kerrie Dancing Butterfly. She did a couple of them there. And then there was a few more facilitators that had sweat lodges, but I don't know their names. Because I wasn't really directly involved with taking care of them personally. I was doing other things, setting things up.

Q. So let's talk about just generally, then, for this ceremony, once you've heated the rocks, how does the ceremony begin?

A. Well, we -- the whole thing is a ceremony. Just putting the sweat lodge together -the beginning of the ceremony is when we put the blankets on. And before we even enter the space with the blankets or anything, we sage ourselves with a stick a sage, Burn that sage ourselves. And then we sage the whole area of the sweat lodge.

Then we put the blankets on and get going. And then the day of the sweat lodge, two hours before we start -- the sweat lodge starts, approximately two hours, we get the rocks burning.

160

We get them nice and hot.

Before we do that, we actually give an offering to the rocks of tobacco and sage. Put that on the rocks before we start the fire.

And then while the fire is burning -- you know -- we just kind of sit around. We get the water ready. And we set up the chairs. And sometimes we put up a tarp sometimes for people because they want to get out of the sun.

Heat up the rocks. And then the people come for the sweat lodge. And before they can enter, every one of them gets saged before they enter the sacred space of the sweat lodge area.

What would you describe that space to be? We know that there is a sweat lodge. Let me put up Exhibit 145.

Tell the jury where the sacred space is that you've just testified about.

Well, that whole area is a sacred space. Like, right on the other side of these rocks is the other side. There is, like, a circle of rocks around the whole thing. Where the wood is kept and where the fire is, it starts about here -- you know -- and it works it's way in. About 50 feet on

the other side of the sweat lodge is the end of it.

3

4

9

19

20

21

23

25

6

13

14

21

22

23

24

25

164

- Q. And you just talked about participants 2 getting saged before they can enter that space?
 - Α. Yes.

1

3

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. First of all, what is sage?
- Sage is a bush that grows in mostly Α. California that we get our sage from. And they let it dry. They tie it together, and we burn it. And it's a symbolic thing to help clear any negative energy and bring good energy to the space.
- 10 Q. And for the participants to get saged, 11 where do they go?
 - They -- they come right up on the Α. left-hand side of this picture here. And there is a little opening in the rocks where it's like a little doorway. So they stand right in front of that with their arms open. You just run the sage smoke around them.
 - Who is it that runs the sage smoke around Q. them before they can enter the space?
 - It depends on the group -- you know. Sometimes it was me, and sometimes it was my wife.

Then with the James Ray group, it was usually one of his Dream Team or the people working with him. And then other times there are other people doing it too.

162

- **Q.** After -- we're just speaking about your experience assisting with sweat lodges at Angel Valley.
- Α. Uh-huh.
- 5 Which, by the way, have you ever done any 6 other sweat lodge assistance work anywhere else?
 - Α.
- 8 Q. So with regard to your experience, what 9 happens, then, after participants are saged?
 - Well, they usually come into the area of the sweat lodge. And they use the chairs, and lot of them get undressed and get ready for the sweat lodge.

And then they -- we have a little fire usually on the outside of the sacred area where we have a little fire where sometimes they write their intentions down on a piece of paper, and then they burn those things so the smoke sets their intentions into motion. And then after that, they usually enter the sweat lodge.

- 21 Q. And as the participants enter the sweat 22 lodge, what do you do?
- 23 A. I just kind of hang out and make sure the 24 fire is burning correctly and that we've got water and everything is ready for the participants. 25

- Before the participants enter the sweat
- 2 lodge, have any heated rocks been put in there yet?
 - Α. No.
 - Q. So once all the participants are inside,
- 5 what happens next?
- 6 They get inside, and the person who is 7 running the sweat lodge will ask us to bring in so 8 many rocks.
 - **Q.** How does that happen?
- 10 Α. I guess what happens is they talk a little bit to the people inside. And then they say 11 12 bring us -- you know -- eight "grandfathers."
- 13 Q. When you say "they," who specifically do 14 you mean?
- 15 Α. Well, the person that's in the sweat 16 lodge that's running the sweat lodge. So the 17 pourer is the one that's in charge. He says -- you 18 know -- bring me so many rocks.

So then I go into the fire. There is a couple of us that get the rocks out, take them out of the fire. Then we take them over here to this little rock right there and place the pitchfork and the rock right on that rock, and then there is somebody that brushes it off. Gets all the soot and stuff off of it.

1 And then we take it to the sweat lodge.

As the door is opened, and we slide the pitchfork

in with the rock. And we say, "Aho Mitakuye

Oyasin." That is part of the ceremony. And

everyone in the sweat lodge says that. That's

welcoming the grandfathers into the sweat lodge.

7 Then someone else takes the stick from 8 there and puts it into the hole and then passes the pitchfork or the shovel back out.

- 10 When that process begins and the pourer 11 calls out for the number of rocks, is the door 12 opened or closed?
 - Α. It's open.
 - And you used the term "grandfather."
- 15 What does that refer to?
- 16 Well, we call the lava rocks grandfathers 17 because -- you know -- the lava rock is the
- 18 original rock that was come out of the volcanoes.
- 19 So they're the oldest rocks we have. We call them
- 20 "grandfathers."
 - Q. And that process of bringing in the number of rocks that the pourer has asked for -- do you do all the rocks at once or one at a time?
 - Α. One at a time.
 - Who is it that decides the number of Q.

- 1 rocks that will be brought in for the ceremony?
 - Α. The pourer.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

14

15

16

17

5

6

7

8

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. We've heard about water. How does the water get in the sweat lodge?
- A. Well, you see there is these five-gallon buckets right here? We fill those up, and we just hand them to the person that's running the sweat lodge. And that person is usually just inside the door just to the right.
- 10 So -- you know -- I mean, that's the first person you see when the door opens.
- 12 When do you fill up those buckets of 13 water.
 - Α. Those -- you know -- during the sweat lodge while it was going on. But before it even started, there is two of them full of water.
 - Q. And where does that water come from?
- 18 Α. The well from the spigot behind the sweat 19 lodge there.
- 20 Q. Once the -- when is it that the water 21 goes in?
- 22 A. Excuse me?
- 23 Q. How is it determined when the water will 24 go into the sweat lodge, when that bucket of water 25 will go in?

166

- 1 When he asks for it. The pourer asks for 2 it.
- Does the pourer typically ask every round 3 Q. for the water bucket? 4
 - Sometimes they do. It depends on the sweat lodge. You know, every sweat lodge is a little different. Some people use less water and some people use more water.
- 9 Q. Once the bucket of water has gone in, how 10 does that bucket go out?
 - Α. When it's empty, they just pass it out and want another one.
- 13 Q. Okay. Once the ceremony has commenced, 14 the pourer has asked for the number of 15 grandfathers, or rocks, that he wants for the first 16 round, what happens?
 - We get to the fire and I open -- you know -- open it up so I can get to the rocks. And we scoop them up with a shovel or a pitchfork, and we take them to the rock and brush them off and hand them into the sweat lodge.
- Q. If the -- I want to get a sense of how 22 23 long it takes to get the rocks inside the sweat
- 24 lodge. How long would it take to get one rock --
- 25 typically take to get one rock inside the sweat

- 1 lodge?
- 2 Α. Well, the first rock usually takes a lot
- longer because you have to get into the fire.
- But -- you know -- just a minute or so. It doesn't
- 5 take long to get them in there because you just got
- to scoop them out and brush them off. You want to
- get them in there as quickly as possible so they
- 8 don't cool off.
- 9 Q. And once all of the rocks for that round 10 are in place, who closes the door to the sweat
- 11 lodae? 12 Α. Well, the pourer tells us when to close
- 13 it, when to open. He's in control of everything.
- 14 And we just -- so he tells us -- you know --
- 15 they're in there. Shut the door. And then so
- 16 whoever is in front of door shuts the door.
- 17 Q. And once that person who is in front of 18 the door shuts the door, where does that person go?
- 19 A. They stay right there, right in front of 20 door.
- 21 Q. In your experience, Mr. Mercer, what is
- it that determines how hot a sweat lodge will get?
- 23 It's determined by how many rocks go into
- 24 it.

25

Q. And, in your experience, can the

168

- rocks be -- are the rocks always uniformly hot?
- 2 Oh, no. It depends upon the fire. When
- 3 I first started doing it, I wasn't -- I wasn't the
- best at keeping the rocks really, really, really
- 5 hot. So as I got more experience, I got hotter and
- 6 hotter rocks.
- 7 Q. And if the rocks are hotter and hotter,
- 8 then how is it determined how hot the sweat lodge
- 9 will be?

14

17

18

20

21

- 10 A. It's all up to the pourer; whoever is inside that asks for the rocks. 11
- 12 Q. For the ceremony, who is it that
- 13 determines how long each round will be?
 - That's the pourer also.
- 15 Q. And who is it who determines how many
- 16 rounds there will be?
 - Α. That's the pourer.
 - Q. Who is it that determines how long the
- 19 door will be open between each round?
 - Α. The pourer.
 - Q. And who is it that determines when the
- 22 sweat lodge ceremony will end?
 - Α. That's the pourer.
- 24 You told us that you don't use the same Q.
- 25 rocks twice?

5

8

14

19

24

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Why is that?
- 3 A. Because once they're used, energetically
- 4 you don't want to use the same rocks again. I
- 5 mean, they're fine. Some of them are cracked. But
- 6 energetically you just want to put those aside
- 7 because they've been heated up. They've been used
- 8 in a ceremony. So we don't want to use them
- 9 again -- you know. So we just put them aside.
- 10 Q. Now, I'd like to ask you specifically
- 11 about the ceremony in 2007 conducted by Mr. Ray
- 12 that you have testified you assisted.
- 13 First of all, tell the jury what your
- 14 role was for that. It was your first sweat lodge
- 15 ceremony?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And it was conducted by whom?
- 18 A. By James Ray.
- 19 Q. And what was your role?
- 20 A. I was helping with the -- keeping the
- 21 fire. So Gary Palisch was the fire keeper
- 22 officially. So he stayed by the door. So I was
- 23 the one that heated up the rocks and got them out
- 24 of the fire and took them up to the door.
 - Q. And who else was assisting on the outside
 - 170

- 1 for that ceremony?
- 2 A. My wife was there and another gentleman
- 3 named Rotillo.
- **Q.** Okay. Do you recall how large of a group
- 5 It was that Mr. Ray was conducting the ceremony
- 6 for?

25

- 7 A. It was rather large. I remember that.
- 8 But I couldn't remember the number of people. I'm
- 9 sure there was over 40.
- **Q.** Do you recall whether there were members
- 11 or people associated with Mr. Ray who were outside
- 12 the sweat lodge?
- 13 A. Yes.
- **Q.** Do you recall how many?
- 15 A. Three or four.
- 16 Q. And this is a yes no question. First of
- 17 all, after the first round, was your attention
- 18 drawn to anybody in particular?
- 19 A. Well, after the first --
- **Q.** This is a yes or no question.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And specifically was it drawn to a
- 23 person? Yes or no?
- 24 A. Well, it's not really yes or no.
- 25 Q. Okay. That's fine. And I'll ask you

- 1 another question. After the second round, was your
- 2 attention drawn to a specific person?
 - A. Well, yes. As a matter of fact.
- **Q.** And that's just a yes or no.
 - A. Okay.
- **Q.** After the third round, was your attention
- 7 drawn to additional people?
 - A. Yes.
- **9 Q.** And this is a yes or no question. At
- 10 some point did you become aware that there was a
- 11 person who appeared to be in distress?
- 12 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Foundation,
- 13 leading the witness.
 - THE COURT: Sustained.
- 15 Q. BY MS. POLK: With regard to the people
- 16 who drew your attention, did you observe -- this is
- 17 yes or no. Did you observe somebody that concerned
- 18 you?
 - A. Yes.
- 20 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance.
- 21 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 22 Answer stands.
- 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: And specifically about that
- 25 person, limiting your answer to what you personally
- 172
- 1 observed about that person, tell the jury what you
- 2 observed that drew your attention.
- 3 A. Well, in particular, there was this one
- 4 lady that came out of sweat lodge who was -- she
- 5 was a tall lady but not -- she wasn't large. But
- 6 she was big enough. And she came out and her eyes
- 7 were rolling into the back of her head. And as she
- 8 hit the fresh air from being in the sweat lodge,
- 9 she passed out and her face went into the dirt, and
- 10 she scraped up her whole face. It was bloody,
- 11 bleeding a little bit.
- **12 Q.** Let me stop you. You just used the words
- 13 that "she passed out." What did you specifically
- 14 observe about her that made you say that?
- 15 A. Well, she crawled to the door, and by the
- 16 time she got to the door, that's when I saw her
- 17 eyes roll back. And then she -- her face went
- 18 straight into the dirt.
- 19 Q. Did you do something with regard to that
- 20 lady? Yes or no?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And specifically what did you do?
 - A. I helped drag her out of the doorway so
 - 4 other people could get out too. And we put her on
- 25 the tarps.

10 11 additional person, do you recall around what round ıt was? 12

A. 13 Well ---

14 Q. Yes or no? Do you recall? And if you

15 don't --

21

25

16 Α. Yes and no.

Q. Okay. 17

A. 18 I mean, yeah. Yes, I do.

19 Q. And generally around what round was it 20 that you -- your attention was drawn to a second person?

22 Α. On the third round. Second, third round.

23 Q. And with respect to that second person,

24 how did you first become aware of that person?

Well, see this is tough to answer

11 assist?

12

Α. Probably 10.

13 Q. And for the first person that you

14 assisted, what did you do to assist them to come

15 out of the sweat lodge? Just talking about that

16 first person.

17 Α. We cannot enter the sweat lodge. So when 18 they get to the door, we just grab their arms and

19 pull them over to the tarps. 20 Q. And with regard to the first person that

you have in mind that you assisted to come from the 22 door to the tarps, what did you assist them

23 specifically to do?

24 I just dragged them. Just got them out of the way. They come to the door, and there is

- other people behind them. It's -- you just got to
 move them. You just got to get them out of the way
 so you can make room for the next person.
- Q. And thinking specifically about the
 person you moved out of the way, without your
 assistance -- this is yes or no. Without your
 assistance, was that person able to get out of the
 way on their own?
- 9 MR. LI: Objection.
- 10 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 11 MR. LI: I would ask that the witness wait for
- 12 the objection before he answers.
- THE COURT: If you would, please, Mr. Mercer,wait until the question is asked and if there is anobjection. Please listen carefully.
- 16 The last answer is stricken.
- 17 Please continue, Ms. Polk.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

- Q. BY MS. POLK: With respect to -- I just want you to think about the first person that you assisted to get from the doorway to the tarp, just about that person, what about that person -- what did you personally observe about that person that made you assist them? Just talk about that one person.
 - A. Okay. When her eyes rolled in the back
- of her head --
- Q. I'm sorry. I didn't want you to talk3 about that person.
- 4 A. The next person?
- **Q.** The second person you assisted go from
- 6 the door to the tarp -- and listen to my question.
- 7 Only talking about that second person, what did you
- 8 personally observe that made you go over and assist
- 9 that person from the door to the tarp?
- MR. LI: Objection. Vague and ambiguous, formof the question.
- 12 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 13 You may answer.
- MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may approach?
- **15** THE COURT: You may answer that question.
- 16 THE WITNESS: When he was crawling up to the
- 17 door, he got to the edge of the door and collapsed
- 17 door, he got to the edge of the door and collapsed
- 18 and was laying there in the dirt. And his face was
- 19 In the dirt. So what we did just grabbed him and20 we pulled him out.
- 21 Q. BY MS. POLK: Thank you. With respect to
- 22 that ceremony in 2007 -- this is a yes or no
- 23 question -- do you recall by the final round
- 24 approximately how many people -- approximately what
- 25 percentage of the participants were outside?

- 1 That's a yes or no.
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** Then tell us approximately what
- 4 percentage of the participants were outside by the
- last round.

2

6

12

15

18

25

5

178

- A. It was close to 50 percent.
- 7 Q. Let's move on to 2008. And I want to
- 8 talk specifically about the ceremony conducted by
- 9 Mr. Ray in 2008. Do you recall -- I know you
- 10 testified about it already. That's when you
- 11 constructed the new kiva?
 - A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. Do you recall the month that Mr. Ray
- 14 conducted his ceremony in 2008?
 - A. I believe it was in September, October.
- 16 You know, I'm not sure. I know it was later in the
- 17 vear.
 - **Q.** Do you recall who was the first group to
- 19 conduct a ceremony in the new kiva in 2008?
- 20 A. I believe it was the Agave group.
- 21 Q. Could you be wrong on that?
- 22 A. Yeah. These things all run together for
- 23 me. It's been a while. So it's hard for me to
- 24 remember exactly the order of everything.
 - Q. I understand. In 2008 were you present
 - then when Mr. Ray conducted his sweat lodge
- 2 ceremony?
- 3 A. Yes, I was.
- **Q.** And tell the jury what your role was.
 - A. I was assisting the fire keeper again.
- **Q.** Who was the main fire keeper?
- 7 A. Garv Palisch.
- **Q.** And who else was present assisting Gary
- 9 Palisch?
- A. Debra Mercer, and my wife was, and girl
 named Anita. I can't remember her last name. And
- 12 then my daughter, I think, was there too.
- Q. Do you recall approximately how manyparticipants there were for Mr. Ray's 2008
- 15 ceremony?
- A. I think that one was a lot bigger because we had to build it bigger for them. I'm thinking about a little over 60 people.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not Mr. Ray hadany members from his staff outside the sweat lodgeduring the ceremony?
- 22 A. Yes, he did.
 - **Q.** Do you recall approximately how many?
 - A. Three or four again that time.
 - Q. And you have testified about tarps. And

23

24

2

5

9

21

- 1 in the photograph that we have up on the overhead,
- 2 which is Exhibit 145, we can see some tarps on the
- ground. Do you recall, Mr. Mercer, when it was
- that tarps began to be used on the outside of the
- sweat lodge? That's yes or no, if you recall.
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 Q. And when do you recall those tarps first
- 8 being used?
- 9 A. It was after the last sweat lodge we had them out there. So the one in '09. I don't think 10 we used it in 08. 11
- 12 Q. And your testimony, then, about 2007
- 13 and --

15

24

1

- Α. 14 You know -- yeah. Yeah. That's right.
 - I don't think we used them on the ground until '09.
- Q. When you testified a few moments ago 16
- 17 about 2007, I believe I heard you say you dragged
- 18 people to the tarps.
- 19 A. Well, that was incorrect because there 20 was no tarps. That's one of the reasons we started 21 using tarps is because we dragged these people out.
- 22 **Q.** Let me stop you right there.
- 23 Α. Okay. I'm sorry.
 - Q. You started using tarps for the first
- 25 time in what year?

182

- A. You know, I believe it was 2009. But I
- 2 don't remember.
- 3 So in 2008, Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 4 ceremony in 2008, you were the assistant fire
- 5 keeper. The process that you described for the
- 6 ceremony itself is that your preparation, heating
- 7 up the rocks, getting the water -- is that all the
- 8 same for each sweat lodge ceremony?
- 9 Α. Yeah.
- Q. 10 Did the saging ceremony occur in 2008 for
- 11 Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony as well?
- Α. 12 Yes.
- 13 Q. And this is a yes or no question. Was
- your attention -- this is now for the 2008 14
- 15 Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony. Yes or no. Was
- 16 your attention drawn to a specific person after the
- 17 first round?

20

- 18 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Leading.
- 19 THE COURT: Overruled.
 - You may answer that.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: Yes or no?
- 22 Α. Yes and no.
- Q. And was your attention drawn specifically 23
- 24 to a person after the second round?
- 25 MR. LI: Objection. Leading.

- THE COURT: Overruled.
- Q. BY MS. POLK: Yes or no. If you can't
- answer a question, just tell me you can't answer it
- 4 the way I'm asking.
 - A. I can't answer that one.
- 6 At some point during the ceremony
- 7 in 2008, was your attention drawn to a specific
- 8 ındıvidual?
 - A. At different times, yes.
- 10 Q. And I want to have you just testify about
- the first person that your attention was drawn to. 11
- 12 Let me ask you a question. Limiting your answer to
- specifically what you personally observed about
- 14 that person, tell the jury what you observed that
- 15 drew your attention.
- 16 A. Well, there was one young lady that came
- 17 out of the sweat lodge. All of her muscles were
- 18 in -- they were, like, cramping. Her whole body
- 19 was cramping. She couldn't get it undone, and we
- 20 gave her some water --
 - MR. LI: Objection. Move to strike.
- Speculation what she could or couldn't do.
- 23 THE COURT: The last part have to be strictly
- 24 602, 701 information --
- 25 Q. BY MS. POLK: And Let me ask you another
 - 184

- 1 auestion --
- 2 THE COURT: Sustained. And it is ordered
- 3 stricken.
- 4 Q. BY MS. POLK: With respect to this lady,
- 5 do you recall around what round it was?
- 6 Α. I think it was by the end of the sweat
- 7 lodae.
- 8 Q. And do you recall where you were when you
- became aware of her?
- 10 Α. I was standing by the door, I would
- 11 think.
- 12 Q. Did you ever go over to her?
- 13 A. Yes, I did.
- 14 And without explaining why something
- 15 might have been happening, I just want you to tell
- 16 the jury what you saw. So you were talking about
- 17 cramping.
- 18 Α. I saw her cramping. Her arms were like 19 this, and her legs were all cramped up, and she was in the fetal position. And that's what I saw. 20
- 21 Q. And let me ask you the next question.
- 22 How long did that cramping -- did you observe how
- 23 long that cramping lasted for?
- 24 Well, yes. We were -- we were trying to
- get her to the showers, I guess. There --

- 1 Q. Let me stop you. Just try to answer my
- 2 question.
- 3 Did you observe for what period of time
- she remained in what you've described as a fetal 5 position?
- 6 Α. About 30 to 45 minutes.
- 7 Q. And during that time period, did you
- 8 observe any changes? Yes or no --
- 9 Α. No.
- 10 Q. Did you observe any changes?
- 11 Α. No, I did not.
- 12 Q. And this is a yes or no. Did somebody
- 13 else other than you then tend to this lady?
- 14 Α. Yes.
- 15 Q. This is a yes or no question. Did you
- 16 assist other individuals leave that ceremony? Did
- 17 you assist them move from the door to some place
- 18 out in the area? Yes or no?
- 19 MR. LI: Objection. Leading.
- 20 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 21 THE COURT: Overruled. The answer stands.
- 22 BY MS. POLK: Do you recall how many
- 23 people -- this is yes or no -- do you recall how
- many people you assisted? 24
- 25 Α. No. I can't recall specifically.
- 1 Q. Can you recall whether you assisted more
- 2 than one individual?
- 3 Α. Yes.
- Q. 4 Do you recall whether you assisted more
- 5 than five individuals?
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 Q. Do you recall whether you assisted more
- 8 than 10 individuals?
- 9 Α. Yes.
- 10 Q. Did you have -- this is yes or no -- any
- 11 personal contact with any of those individuals that
- you assisted? Yes or no? 12
- Α. No. 13
- Q. 14 With respect to -- I want to go back to
- the 2007 sweat lodge ceremony conducted by Mr. Ray. 15
- 16 Did you observe anybody use water to cool off
- participants? Yes or no? 17
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 Q. Who was it in 2007, if you know, was
- 20 cooling off individuals?
- 21 Α. One of the James Ray team members.
- 22 Q. What was used to cool off participants
- 23 who came out?
- 24 Α. A hose, water and a hose.
- 25 Q. Can you show us on this picture where the

1 hose spigot is.

5

15

18

21

2

5

8

186

185

- 2 Α. You can't see it from here. But it's
- 3 approximately right here about a hundred yards from
- behind the sweat lodge. Maybe 50 yards. 4
 - And how many hoses did you have running
- 6 in 2007, if you recall?
- 7 We had two of them. Two linked together
- 8 so it could reach all the way to this side of the
- sweat lodge.
- 10 And for 2008, did you have that same
- 11 arrangement for the hose?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 Q. I want to talk about the 2009 sweat lodge
- ceremony conducted by Mr. Ray. 14
 - Α. Okay.
- 16 Q. You were present in October of 2009?
- 17 Α.
 - Q. What was your role for that ceremony?
- 19 Α. I was the fire keeper for that one.
- 20 Q. Who else assisted?
 - Α. My wife, Debbie; a gentleman, Rotillo,
- 22 and my daughter, Sarah.
- 23 When was it that you agreed to do the
- 24 ceremony for Mr. Ray for October of 2009?
- 25 It was about three weeks or so before the

188

- 1 sweat lodge.
 - And you testified this morning that
- by 2009 you were no longer working for Angel 3
- Valley; is that correct? 4
 - Α. That's correct.
- 6 Q. Who asked you to do the ceremony in
- 7 October of 2009?
 - Α. Michael Hamilton.
- 9 And you testified this morning that you
- 10 also did a ceremony for another group in May
- 11 of 2009?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 Q. Who asked you to do that ceremony?
- Well, it was set up by Gary Palisch. And
- 15 so I -- it was between him -- he wasn't there
- 16 anymore. So it would have to be Michael.
- 17 Were you paid, Mr. Mercer, to assist with
- 18 the October 2009 sweat lodge?
- 19 Α. As far as tips go, I got tips as an
- 20 assistant.
 - Q. Did the Hamiltons pay you?
- 22 Α. No. They did -- well, no, they didn't.
- 23 Q. You don't recall getting paid?
- 24 Α. Not for the first one, I didn't.
 - Q. The May one?
- Page 185 to 188 of 281

- Α. Yeah. 1
- 2 Q. And how about for the October one?
- 3 Α. Yes.
- Q. 4 Do you recall how -- who paid you for the
- 5 October event?
- 6 Α. Gary did.
- 7 Q. Do you recall how much you were paid?
- 8 Α. I can't remember. No.
- 9 Q. You just mentioned tips. Where would
- 10 tips come from?
- 11 Α. The tips come from the participants that
- 12 go into the sweat lodge. They -- traditionally
- 13 they bring an offering to the fire keeper. And not
- 14 always is it money. It could be -- you know --
- anything. I was given a pouch one time. But they 15
- bring an offering, so that in his group they 16
- brought money. 17
- 18 Q. "His group" being who?
- 19 A. James Ray. And other groups did too.
- 20 Q. Okay. So let's talk about the sweat
- lodge ceremony in October of 2009. Do you recall, 21
- 22 first of all, the day being Thursday, October 8?
- 23 Α. No.

- Q. And we're looking now at a photograph on
- 25 the overhead of the sweat lodge for October 2009.
- 1 Do you recall when it was that you
- 2 started the fire to heat the rocks?
- 3 Α. I started around 2:00 o'clock.
- 4 Q. Do you recall what time the ceremony was
- 5 supposed to begin?
- 6 Α. It was around 4:00.
- Q. 7 You think --
- 8 Α. That was the scheduled time. But nobody
- 9 really got in there until around 5:00 or so,
- 10 because I remember the fire was burning for at
- 11 least three hours before.
- Q. I want to review those times with you and 12
- 13 get you to think about those times again.
- 14 MR. LI: Objection. Leading.
- 15 Q. BY MS. POLK: We're talking about 2009.
- 16 MR. LI: Objection. Leading. The witness has
- 17 answered.

18

- THE COURT: Sustained as to form.
- 19 Go ahead and continue with the question,
- 20 please, Ms. Polk.
- 21 Q. BY MS. POLK: My question is about
- the 2009 sweat lodge ceremony. Do you remember 22
- 23 about what time it ended?
- 24 Well, it was getting dark. I would say
- 25 it was 5:00, 6:00 o'clock.

- Q. And then working your way backwards, do 2
 - you recall if the ceremony was in the afternoon or
- the evening?

1

5

R

- 4 Well, it started in the afternoon and Α. went into the evening.
- 6 How many hours before the ceremony began 7 did you start heating the rocks?
 - Α. Well, two hours.
- 9 Would you tell the jury what wood you
- 10 used to heat the rocks for Mr. Ray's 2009 sweat
- 11 lodge ceremony.
- 12 A. I used the wood that was provided to us
- 13 from Angel Valley. It was stacked right up there.
- It was the wood -- I assume it was the wood that came from the construction site. 15
- 16 Q. And for the 2008 ceremony that you just
- 17 testified about, what wood did you use?
- 18
 - We used some of that construction wood
- 19 and some natural wood.
- 20 **Q.** And, if you recall, for the 2007 ceremony
- 21 conducted by Mr. Ray, do you recall what wood you
- 22 used?

24

25

5

- 23 Α. That was all natural.
 - Q. By "natural," what do you mean?
 - Α. Just downed trees by the creek that we
 - 192
 - would get. And we'd cut them up and bring them
 - over to the sweat lodge.
- 3 Q. Who collected the rocks for the 2009
- ceremony? 4
 - Α. Rotillo.
- 6 Q. What kind of rocks were they?
- 7 Α. Lava rocks.
- 8 Q. In preparing the rocks and in heating the
- 9 rocks, do you add anything to the fire?
- 10 No. Just before we start the fire, we
- 11 add a pinch of tobacco and a pinch of sage for an
- 12 offering.
- 13 **Q.** Do you recall approximately how many
- 14 participants Mr. Ray had for his 2009 sweat lodge?
- 15 A. I don't know the specific amount. There
- 16 was over 50 of them. Did you have a conversation with Mr. Ray 17
- 18 before Mr. Ray and the participants went in the
- 19 sweat lodge?
- 20 A. I let him know that this was the hottest 21 fire I've ever had and the rocks were really hot.
- 22 Q. When did that conversation occur?
- 23 Just before they burned their intention
 - papers on another fire. So it was after they got
- saged. So they were in the sacred space by then.

- 1 Q. How did you -- where did you find Mr. Ray
- 2 to have the conversation with him?
- A. He was --- he was standing inside the sweat lodge, I think, or inside the sweat area, and I just walked up to him.
 - Q. Tell the jury what you told him.
- 7 A. I told him that these are the hottest 8 rocks ever that I've ever had and the most intense 9 fire that I've ever had.
- 10 Q. Did Mr. Ray respond to you?
- 11 A. Yeah. He said, good. And then he 12 brought me into the another circle where all the 13 people were standing around to -- before they 14 burned their intention papers, and he had me tell
- 15 them the same thing.

6

- Q. Do you recall what you told theparticipants?
- 18 A. I told them that this is the hottest fire 19 and the hottest rocks we've ever had.
- Q. Do you recall whether Mr. Ray said
 anything to the participants then about what you
 had just said?
- 23 A. Yeah. I can't recall.
- **Q.** For the 2009 ceremony where were you for most of the ceremony?
- A. Well, you see I'm standing here. And in
 between here and all around the fire and back where
- 3 the firewood is, pretty much I would take care of
- $\boldsymbol{4}$ $\,$ that whole area right there. I was mostly watching
- 5 the fire.
- **Q.** Do you recall where your wife, Debbie,
- 7 was?
- 8 A. Yes. She was at the door.
- **Q.** Do you see Debbie in this picture?
- 10 A. Yes. She's right here at the door.
- 11 Q. Was Sarah there -- your daughter?
- 12 A. Yes. She was there. But I don't see her
- 13 in this picture.
- 14 Q. Do you recall what Sarah was doing during 15 the ceremony?
- A. Mostly she was helping us brush the rocksoff and there for support.
 - Q. Why do you brush those rocks off?
- A. Because we don't want to bring anything attached to the rocks in there. We want to make sure it's nice and clean and it's just a hot rock so there isn't any smoke or anything that come out
- 23 of it.

How do you brush them off?

25 A. With a whisk broom.

- Q. Once the sweat lodge ceremony began by
- 2 Mr. Ray, do you recall how many rocks were called
- 3 for for the first round?
- 4 A. No.
 - Q. Do you recall, Mr. Mercer, how many rocks
- 6 were called for by Mr. Ray for any of the rounds?
- 7 A. I remember one round that he only asked 8 for four rocks.
 - Q. Do you recall what round that was?
- 10 A. No. It was -- I can't say specifically,
- 11 but it was in the four or five round area.
- **Q.** Do you recall how many rounds Mr. Ray
- 13 held?
- 14 A. There was eight of them.
- 15 Q. Do you recall -- do you recall if Mr. Ray
- 16 called for rocks before his final rounds?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you recall how many?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Do you recall how many rocks were
- 21 gathered before the ceremony began in preparation
- 22 for the ceremony?
- 23 A. There was a hundred rocks.
 - Q. And do you know personally how many rocks
- 25 Mr. Ray used for his ceremony? Yes or no.
- 194

193

1

5

9

17

18

24

4

5

11

17

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Do you know where Mr. Ray sat for
- 3 the 2009 ceremony inside the sweat lodge?
 - A. Yes
 - Q. Can you show the jury where.
- 6 A. Well, here's the door right where Debbie
- 7 is. The first person to the right is where he sat.
- **Q.** Do you recall where Mr. Ray sat for
- 9 his 2008 ceremony?
- 10 A. It's the same spot.
 - Q. Do you recall where Mr. Ray sat for his
- 12 2007 ceremony?
- 13 A. The same spot.
- 14 Q. While the sweat lodge ceremony was going
- 15 on in 2009, were you able to hear voices from
- 16 inside?
 - A. Oh, sure.
- 18 Q. And generally what sorts of things did
- 19 you hear?
- 20 A. I heard people yelling out their
- 21 intentions. Their was some singing going on. You
- 22 could hear the pourer talking and explaining things
- 23 and doing the ceremony. It's rather loud
- 23 and doing the ceremony. It's rather it
- 24 sometimes.
- 25 Q. And the pourer being Mr. Ray?

Q.

18

18 back to the fire. 19 Q. Did you ever notice that man again that

20 day? Α. Sure. 22 Q.

When did you see him again?

23 I saw him while he was sitting there and

24 talking a few times. And then at the end of the

25 sweat lodge, he went back in.

21

22

23 Α. Yeah. One of his team members, I guess. 24

Q. And then what did you hear Mr. Ray say?

A. That -- that he's not going to die, and

18

19

20

21

- he'll be fine, and everything is going to be okay. 1
- 2 Did you ever hear Mr. Ray address any of
- 3 the participants who had left the sweat lodge?
 - Α. Yeah. He -- he encouraged them to come back in.
- 6 Q. Do you recall what words he used to
- 7 encourage people to come back in?
 - A. Something like the door is open and we're going to start a new round. Does anybody want to come back in?
- 10

5

8

9

- Q. With respect to the 2008 ceremony, did 11
- you hear Mr. Ray address participants who had left 12
- 13 his sweat lodge?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And in 2008 what did you hear him say?
- 16 A. Pretty much the same thing. The door is 17 open. If you want to come back in, you can.
- 18 Did you notice a difference between the
- 19 way Mr. Ray addressed participants in 2009 who left
- 20 and the way he addressed them in 2008?
- 21 MR. LI: Objection. Form of the question.
- 22 Speculation. Foundation.
- 23 THE COURT: That, again, called for yes or no.
- 24 You may answer that if you can.
- 25 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
 - 202

201

- Q. BY MS. POLK: Did you notice a difference
- 2 between the way in 2009 Mr. Ray addressed those who
- 3 had left between 2009 and the way he addressed them
- 4 ın 2008?

1

- 5 Α. Yes.
- 6 Q. And did you notice a difference between
- 7 the way Mr. Ray addressed those who had left
- in 2009 and the way he'd addressed the 2007 8
- 9 participants who had left? Yes or no?
- Α. Yes. 10
- 11 Q. Was there a difference between 2007
- and 2008 in the way Mr. Ray addressed those who had 12
- left? 13
- 14 Α. No, not really.
- 15 Q. Would you tell us what the difference,
- 16 then, between 2009 and 2008 was with respect to the
- 17 way Mr. Ray addressed those who had left?
- 18 Α. He just ---
- 19 MR. LI: Objection. Form of the question,
- 20 lack of foundation, speculation.
- 21 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 22 BY MS. POLK: You can answer.
- He was louder. Louder and he seemed to 23
- 24 talk a bit -- a little bit more.
- 25 Q. In 2009 -- this is a yes or no

- 1 question -- were you ever made aware of a safety
- plan with regard to the participants?
- 3 MR. LI: Objection. Lack of foundation. Term
- "safety plan" is vague and ambiguous, subject of a 4
- 5 lot of pretrial motions.
- 6 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 7 BY MS. POLK: Were you ever informed
 - whether there was a nurse present in 2009?
 - Α. Yes.
- 10 Q. Do you recall who informed you of that?
- 11 Yes or no?

8

9

12

15

18

24

- Α. No. I can't.
- 13 Q. Do you recall when it was you became
- 14 aware of that?
 - The day of the sweat lodge. Α.
- 16 Do you recall whether you became aware of
- 17 it before the sweat lodge began?
 - Yeah. While we were getting the firewood
- 19 all together and getting stuff going.
- 20 Did you ever have a conversation before
- 21 the sweat lodge ceremony began with a person who
- was identified to you as a nurse? Yes or no? 22
- 23 Α. Yeah. I did talk to her.
 - Q. And specifically what did you talk about?
- 25 Α. The weather.

- 204
- 1 Q. Did she ever discuss with you anything
- pertaining to taking care of participants?
- Α. No.
- 4 Q. Mr. Mercer, by the final round of
- Mr. Ray's 2009 ceremony, do you recall how many
- 6 participants were inside for the final round?
- 7 There was still quite a few in there.
- 8 There was well over half.
- 9 Q. Do you recall how that ceremony ended
- 10 ın 2009?
- 11 A. Yeah. Just like any other one -- you
- know. He said that -- you know -- open the door,
- 13 and all the people came out, just like regular.
- 14 Q. At some point were you aware of people in
- 15 distress?
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 Q. And this is after it's over. What made
- 18 you became aware of people in distress?
- 19 Well, in one particular case, my wife was
- 20 yelling. I could hear -- I was on the other side
- 21 of the sweat lodge by the door. I could hear her
- 22 yelling for help. She yelled for me. I can't
- 23 remember what she said.
- 24 But I went over to the other side of the
- sweat lodge. And there was two people that her and

- my daughter were pulling out. And --1
- 2 Was there an opening to the sweat lodge
- 3 in the back?
 - Α. Yeah. She opened it up herself.
- 5 Q. Before the ceremony started, was it open 6 back there?
- 7 Α. Oh, no.
- Were you aware when your wife opened it 8 Q. at the time?
- 9 Α. 10
- 11 Q. How did you become aware, then, that she
- had opened the back? 12
- A. When she yelled. 13
- Q. And you ran over there? 14
- 15 A. Yeah.
- Q. Tell the jury what you saw. 16
- 17 I saw two people laying just outside the 18 sweat lodge. And then there was another guy still inside the sweat lodge. And I helped my daughter 19 pull him out. And then I went over to the young 20 21 lady that was laying there and the first two that my wife and daughter pulled out. And I started 22 23 checking their vital signs.
- 24 Q. Mr. Mercer, I'm going to show you
- Exhibits 822, 823 and 827, which are photographs 25
- taken the next day, on October 9th. I'm going to 1 2 ask you generally what these are photographs are
- 3 of.
- 4 A. The sweat lodge.
- 5 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I move for the
- admission of Exhibits 822, 823 and 827. 6
- 7 MR. LI: No objection.
- THE COURT: 822, -23 and -27 are admitted. 8
- 9 (Exhibits 822, 823 and 827 admitted.)
- 10 Q. BY MS. POLK: I'll put up on the overhead
- 11 823 to ask you, Mr. Mercer, what part of the sweat
- lodge are we looking at here? 12
- Α. That is the front part. You can see the 13 door is open. 14
- 15 Q. Then I'm going to put up on the overhead 822. Do you know what side of the sweat lodge 16
- 17 we're looking at here?
- 18 That would be around the back of it. Not quite all the way back on the right side, I guess. 19
- 20 Then I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 21 827. Do you know what we're looking at here?
- A. That's the inside and a couple of flaps 22 23 that were opened up.
- Q. And you've just testified about running 24 25 to the area where your wife had opened up the back?

- Uh-huh.
- Q. Do you see that area on this photograph?
- 3 Α. It was this area over here.
- 4 Q. And when you arrived, two people were
- 5 out?

2

6

11

18

21

1

5

7

8

13

16

17

19

21

23

206

- Α. Two people were out.
- 7 Q. And then you testified about a third
- 8 person. Where was that third person?
- 9 The third person was approximately --
- 10 maybe it was right here where this opening was.
 - Was that person in or out?
- 12 Α. He was still inside.
- 13 Q. Do you know how that person got out?
- 14 Yeah. I dragged him out with my
- daughter. 15
- 16 Q. What did you do -- was that person male 17 or female?
 - Α. He was a male.
- 19 Q. Did you ever learn that person's name?
- 20 Α. Yes, I did. But I don't remember it now.
 - What did you do with that person?
- 22 Α. Well, I noticed that he was still
- 23 breathing, so just left him in the fetal position
- and put him just outside. After that more people
- 25 came around.

- 208
- Q. The other two people that were dragged
- out by your wife and daughter -- do you recall if
- 3 they were male or female?
- 4 Α. One was a male, one was a female.
 - And when you first became aware of them,
- 6 were they already outside?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What did you then do for them?
- 9 Well, I checked their vital signs. I
- looked at their face. And their face was starting
- 11 to turn blue, and their lips were blue. I checked
- for any breathing and any pulse. 12
 - - Q. What did you -- with respect to the
- 14 female, tell the jury specifically what you
- 15 observed.
 - A. I observed blue lips, a blueing face, a grayish face, no pulse. I checked on her neck and their arm. And there was no signs ever breathing either.
- 20 Q. Do you have first aid training?
 - A. Yeah. I'm a first response -- emergency
- 22 first response instructor.
 - Q. When did you get your training?
- 24 Α. In 2004.
 - Q. And are you a certified emergency first

- 1 response trainer?
- 2 A. Right now I am nonteaching status.
- 3 But --

8

- 4 Q. In 2009 what were you?
 - A. Nonteaching status.
- 6 Q. When had you gone from a teacher to a
- 7 nonteacher?
 - Α. Probably 2008.
- 9 Q. And as a teacher, what does that mean?
- 10 Α. I would teach people who wanted to learn 11 emergency first aid and CPR, adult CPR.
- 12 Q. Did you ever learn the name of the
- female? 13
- Α. 14 Kirby Brown.
- 15 Q. And when did you learn her name?
- Α. 16 Couple days afterwards.
- 17 Q. The second person that came out in the
- area where Kirby Brown came out -- was that male or 18
- 19 female?
- 20 Α. He was a male.
- 21 Q. And what did you do for that person?
- 22 Α. Well, I checked his vital signs also and
- 23 saw that he didn't have any vital signs either.
- 24 The same thing. His face was getting gray. His
- 25 lips were blue. There was no pulse or no
- 210

- 1 breathing.
- 2 Q. Did you hear anything -- did you hear
- 3 interaction between your wife, Debbie, and anybody
- 4 else before you ran over there?
- 5 Α. No.
- 6 Q. The first you were aware of was your wife
- 7 calling for you?
- 8 Α. Exactly.
- 9 With respect to the female that you
- 10 learned was Kirby Brown, did you make an
- 11 observation about her overall physical build?
- Α. Yeah. 12
- Q. 13 What did you observe?
- 14 Well, she was a thin girl and in good
- 15 shape.
- 16 Q. And with respect -- did you learn the
- 17 name of the male?
- 18 Α. I did. But I can't recall it right now.
- 19 Q. Do you recall that his name was James
- 20 Shore?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. Did you observe Mr. Shore's overall
- 23 physical build?
- 24 Α. Yeah. He was a rather large gentleman.
- 25 Q. And did you make any observations about

- 1 whether he was -- appeared to be fit to you?
- 2 Well, his belly was rather big. It
- didn't look like he was a fitness instructor or
- 4 anything like that.
 - Did anybody else come over to help you
- 6 with Kirby and James?
- 7 Yeah. Right after I told my wife to call
- 8 for the ambulance, there were five or six people
- there right away.
- 10 When was it -- how soon from the time you
- ran over and took the vitals was it that you told
- 12 your wife to call 9-1-1?
- 13 Α. Instantly. Right after the I checked the
- 14 girl out.

5

- 15 Q. Did you see what your wife did?
- 16 Α. She -- she left.
- 17 Do you recall today, then, how much time
- passed from the time Debbie left and emergency 18
- 19 first responders arrived?
- 20 Α. Probably half hour.
 - Did anybody identifying themselves as a
- doctor come over to help with the two people you
- 23 were with?

21

24

3

5

8

- Α. Yeah. That's why I stepped aside.
- 25 Because someone identified themselves as a doctor
- 212
 - and said she was in control. So I just stayed with
 - Kirby, and I held her head and made sure that her
 - airway was open and checked her vital signs. Q. Did you perform any CPR on Kirby? 4
 - Α. Yeah. At first I gave her a first couple

 - puffs. And then other people came over, and so
 - 7 they just took over.
 - **Q.** And did you perform any CPR on James
 - 9 Shore?
 - 10 Α. No, I did not.
 - 11 Q. Did you see whether anybody else started
 - 12 CPR on James?
 - 13 Yeah. There were some people there.
 - 14 There was, like, three or four people working on
 - 15 him.
 - 16 Q. Did you ever observe, again, the third
 - 17 individual that was pulled out?
 - 18 Α. Not that I can recall. Because I just
 - 19 stayed with Kirby right then until the paramedics
 - 20 came.
 - 21 Q. After the paramedics came, what did you
 - 22 do?
 - 23 Α. I went and assisted any other person that
 - looked like they needed help.
 - Q. Do you recall how many other people you

1 assisted?

8

- 2 Α. Not particular numbers. But there were several people that needed something. I actually helped carry people to the helicopters at two different occasions.
- 6 Q. Do you know who it was that you carried 7 to the helicopters?
 - A. I have no idea.
- 9 At the scene were you ever aware of Q.
- anyone else who was unconscious? 10
- 11 MR. LI: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
- 12 the term "unconscious."
- 13 THE COURT: It's just the terminology. But
- 14 just as to form, Ms. Polk.
- 15 Q. BY MS. POLK: After attending to James
- Shore and Kirby Brown, did you attend anybody else 16
- whose eyes were closed? 17
- 18 A, I didn't. No.
- 19 Q. How long were you at the area that night?
- 20 A. Probably till about 8:00 or 9:00. I
- 21 can't say for sure. But we were there until most
- 22 everyone left because the police told everybody
- they needed to stay around. 23
- Okay. Where were you when the police 24 Q.
- 25 arrived?
- 1 A. I was working on Kirby Brown.
- 2 Q. Where were you when the police announced
- 3 that everybody needed to stay around?
- 4 A. You know, I don't think I heard that from
- 5 a police officer himself. But I heard it from
- 6 other people because I was going to go home. And I
- 7 heard that -- you know -- you need to stick around.
- 8 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 9 Exhibit 229 and just ask you generally if you
- 10 recognize that scene?
 - Α. Yes, I do.
- 12 And when you were tending to James Shore
- 13 and Kirby Brown, were you aware of where Mr. Ray
- was? 14

11

- 15 Well, no. He -- well, before I went over
- 16 there, he was sitting in this little tarp over
- 17 here. And then at one time when I was working on
- 18 her, he came over, and I saw him looking at what
- 19 was going on.
- 20 THE COURT: Excuse me, Ms. Polk. I don't
- 21 believe that exhibit has been admitted.
- 22 MS. POLK: I'm sorry. You're right.
- 23 MR. LI: We'll stipulate.
- 24 MS. POLK: Your Honor, this is Exhibit 229.
- 25 THE COURT: 229 is admitted.

- (Exhibit 229 admitted.)
- 2 Q. BY MS. POLK: When Mr. Ray came over to
- where Kirby Brown and James Shore was, you were
- 4 still there?

1

5

6

8

11

14

24

1

2

11

17

- Α.
- Q. Do you recall if he said anything?
- 7
 - Q. Do you recall what he did?
- 9 I think he was just looking at what was
- 10 going on.
 - Q. I'm going to -- I'm going to put up on
- 12 the overhead Exhibit 278 and ask you if you
- 13 recognize what this is a photograph of.
 - THE COURT: And that will be admitted by
- 15 stipulation?
- 16 MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor.
- 17 MS. POLK: I'm sorry.
- 18 THE COURT: 278 is admitted.
- 19 (Exhibit 278 admitted.)
- 20 THE WITNESS: That's the sweat lodge after it
- 21 was over.
- 22 Q. BY MS. POLK: Do you know who the man
- 23 sitting in that chair is?
 - Α. No, I don't.
- 25 Q. And are you able to read the shirt?
- 216
- Α. The Verde Valley District, Fire District.
- Q. Yes.
- Your Honor, counsel has stipulated to the
- admission of Exhibit 281. No. Let me check that
- 5 again.
- 6 821, 819, 820, 818, 817, 825. 822 might
- already be in. I'm not sure.
- 8 THE COURT: Ms. Polk, I've got a note that the
- jurors are requesting a break at this time. If we
- 10 can do that, of course.
 - Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take an
- afternoon recess, then. Please be reassembled at
- 13 15 after. That's about 25 minutes. Remember the
- 14
 - admonition.
- 15 Mr. Mercer, recall that rule of exclusion
- 16 I discussed with you earlier.
 - You are excused at this time as well.
- 18 (Recess.)
- 19 THE COURT: The record will show the presence
- 20 of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys, the jury.
- 21 Mr. Mercer is back on the witness stand.
- 22 Ms. Polk, we do need to stop about 4:30
- 23 this afternoon.
- 24 So please continue.
- MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.

8

15

19

22

1

2

5

9

218

- 1 Q. Mr. Mercer, you testified earlier that
- 2 you are an emergency first responder instructor.
- 3 Where did you get your training?
- 4 A. From an organization, PADI, Professional
 - Instructor of Diving -- I don't know what it is.
- 6 It's a diving organization. Scuba diving.
- **Q.** When did you get that certification?
- 8 A. In '06, 2006.
- 9 Q. Where?

5

- 10 A. In Phoenix at a -- at a dive shop. I
- 11 can't remember of name of it right now.
- **Q.** Are you a scuba diver?
- 13 A. Yes, I am. I'm an instructor.
- **Q.** How long was the training that you
- 15 received to become a first responder instructor?
- 16 A. I think it lasted a week.
- 17 Q. And do you recall approximately how many
- 18 courses, then, you taught as the instructor?
- 19 A. I taught -- I think it's people. They
- 20 mark it as people. I think there is about 25
- 21 people.
- **Q.** Between what period of time?
- 23 A. 2006 to 2008.
- **Q.** And as an emergency first responder
- 25 instructor, do you know how to tell the difference
- 1 whether someone is conscious or unconscious?
- 2 A. Yes. I think so.
- 3 MR. LI: Your Honor, if I could just have a
- 4 point of clarification. I'm not sure he's
- 5 testified as an emergency first responder. I think
- 6 that's a paramedic. If we can clarify what exactly
- 7 he's been trained in.
- 8 THE COURT: Ms. Polk, ask an additional
- 9 foundational question.
- **10 Q.** BY MS. POLK: What is your certification
- 11 in?
- 12 A. I'm an emergency first responder
- 13 instructor.
- **14 Q.** And I can't remember if you answered my
- **15** question. But as an emergency first responder
- 16 instructor, do you know how to tell whether someone
- 17 is unconscious or conscious?
- 18 A. Yes, I can.
- **19 Q.** And with respect to Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 20 ceremony in October of 2009, other than the three
- 21 people you testified about, did you observe whether
- 22 anybody else at the scene was unconscious?
- 23 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Tell the jury what you observed.
- 25 A. I observed people laying on the ground

- with -- with no response. They were breathing and
- 2 their heart was beating, but they weren't moving or
- 3 they weren't doing anything.
- **Q.** When was it that you first observed
- 5 somebody in that condition?
 - A. That was after the paramedics arrived and
- 7 I wasn't working on Kirby anymore.
 - Q. In 2009 did you observe whether any
- 9 participant was vomiting?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. When did you observe someone vomiting?
- 12 A. When this person was coming out of the --
- 13 right out of the sweat lodge right at the door.
- 14 And they vomited right there.
 - Q. Do you recall what round that was?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. Do you recall if you observed more than
- 18 one person vomiting in 2009?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you recall approximately how many
- 21 people?
 - A. Three or four.
- **Q.** And with respect to Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 24 ceremony in 2008 -- this is a yes or no question --
- 25 did you observe anybody vomiting?
- 220

- A. Yes.
- Q. And with respect to Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 3 ceremony in 2007, yes or no, did you observe
- 4 anybody vomiting?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** In Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony
- 7 of 2009, did you observe the eyes of any
- 8 participants at any time?
 - A. Sure.
- **Q.** Specifically what did you observe about a
- 11 participant's eyes?
- 12 A. There was two ladies, actually, that they
- 13 would look right through you. They were up and
- 14 they were sitting, but they couldn't tell you their
- 15 name. They couldn't tell you what the date was,
- 16 what year it was. They had no idea where they
- is that year it much they had no face this a day
- 17 were. But you could ask them questions, and they'd
- look at you, but their eyes would go right pastyou.
- 19 **you.** 20 Q.
 - Q. Do you recall what round that was?
 - A. That was by the end of the sweat lodge.
 - Q. And this is yes or no question. In 2008
- 23 at any time during or after Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 24 ceremony, then, did you observe participants' eyes?
 - A. Yes.

24

21

3

5

6

7

9

10

14

15

16

224

- 1 Q. In 2007, yes or no, at any time during or 2 after Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony, did you
- observe the eyes of participants? 3
 - Α. Yes.

4

- 5 Q. In 2009 did you observe any other 6 nonordinary symptoms among the participants?
- 7 MR. LI: Objection to the term "nonordinary
- symptoms." Form of the question. 8
- 9 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 10 Q. BY MS. POLK: In 2009, Mr. Mercer, did you observe any other symptoms of distress other 11 than what you've already testified to? 12
- Α. Yes. 13
- Q. 14 And specifically what did you observe?
- Just people crawling out of the sweat 15 lodge, laying around, getting hosed off, and just 16 laying in the dirt and laying on the tarps, and 17 just their faces are all red. And they're just 18 19 laying in the dirt trying to recover from their experience. 20
- Q. I want to ask you about the wood used 21 in 2009 to heat the rocks. You testified about the 22 wood -- I believe you used the term "construction 23 wood." 24
- 25 Α. Yes.
- 1 Q. Do you know -- this is yes or no. Do you know whether or not that wood was pressed? 2
- Α. 3 No.
- Q. You do not know? 4
- 5 Α. No.
- 6 Q. And do you know whether or not that wood
- 7 was treated?
- 8 Α. No.
- Q. You do not know? 9
- Α. No, I do not. 10
 - Q. Do you recall, Mr. Mercer, what
- directions the smoke from your fire was blowing 12
- in 2009? 13

11

14

15

16

17

18

- A. It would blow in all directions. Right there it was -- it would seem to be going up and to the east a bit, but -- you know -- the wind would pick up and -- you know -- in front of the fire it draws the smoke at you. So it would swirl around.
- Do you recall whether the smoke ever went 19 inside the sweat lodge itself? 20
- A. No. It did not. 21
- 22 Do you recall -- we'll put up on the 23 overhead Exhibit 230. Directing your attention to
- 24
- the tent here, do you recall whether or not there
- was -- there were beverages to drink for Mr. Ray's 25

- October 2009 sweat lodge? 1
 - Α. Yes.
 - Q. Did you drink any of it?
- A. Yes. I probably did. 4
 - Q. Did you get sick?
 - Α. No.
 - Q. Do you recall whether or not there was
- anything to eat? 8
 - That day during the sweat lodge, there wasn't. But afterwards I believe they brought out some fruit. We usually do. You know, I can't
- 12 remember specifically if they brought out fruit for 13 this one or if they ate it back in the kitchen.
 - Q. Do you recall if you ate any of the fruit after the ceremony?
 - Α. I probably didn't.
- 17 Q. Did you ever receive any instruction from
- Mr. Ray or his staff about how to care for a 18
- 19 participant during his sweat lodge ceremony?
- 20 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Subject to
- 21 motion that we have under consideration.
- 22 Relevance. Also saying Mr. Ray giving the
- 23 instructions.
 - THE COURT: There wasn't a reference to a
- 25 year.

24

1

2

8

14

222

Sustained.

- Q. BY MS. POLK: For the 2009 sweat lodge
- 3 ceremony, did you ever receive any instruction from
- Mr. Ray or Mr. Ray's staff about how to care for
- 5 participants?
- 6 MR. LI: Same objection, Your Honor.
- 7 THE COURT: Overruled.
 - You may answer that.
- 9 THE WITNESS: No.
- 10 BY MS. POLK: And for Mr. Ray's 2008
- 11 sweat lodge ceremony, did you ever receive any
- 12 instructions from Mr. Ray or Mr. Ray's staff about
- 13 how to care for participants?
 - MR. LI: Same objection.
- 15 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 16 BY MS. POLK: Why, Mr. Mercer, did you do Q.
- 17 what you did for the participants in 2009?
- 18 Α. Because they looked like they needed 19 help.
- 20 Did you understand that to be your Q.
- 21 function there?
- 22 Α. Well, no. My function was a fire keeper.
 - Q. I want to look now at a series of
- 24 photographs.
 - If I can just check with the clerk.

A. Another towel, looks like. 18 19 **Q.** And do you know what this is over here? 20 It looks like one of the blankets from

the tarp got on top of the sweat lodge?

Do you know how a blanket from underneath

Well, yeah. It's ripped apart. So if

you're going to lift it up, you've going to get to

underneath the tarps.

18 Q. Does the sweat lodge normally look like 19 this after a sweat? 20 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Obviously, 21 the police have come to the scene. THE COURT: Sustained. 22 23 BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put on the 24 overhead Exhibit 818. 25 Do you recognize that?

21

22

23

24

- 1 Yes, I do.
- 2 You had testified about a second fire
- where the intentions were thrown in to be burned?
 - Α. Yes.

5

13

- Q. Do you see the location of that fire in
- this photograph? 6
- 7 A. No. I don't.
- Q. 8 Can you point to the jury where it would
- 9 be, off to what side,
- A. It would be off to the right side of the 10 picture, outside here by where the chairs are but 11
- just over further. Probably another 50 feet or so. 12 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 14 Exhibit 819. Again, do you recognize this
- photograph? 15
- A. Yes, I do. 16
- Q. Do you recognize what this is? 17
- It looks like a five-gallon bucket upside 18
- down. 19
- 20 Q. Do you recognize what this is?
- 21 Α. Yeah. That's one of the water buckets.
- Q. Do you have a recollection from the 22
- 23 afternoon of October 8th of those buckets being
- 24 there?

25

1

- A. Yeah. They were on the table in that
 - 230
- tarp with water and electrolytes and juice in them.
- 2 There was three of them, I think, all together.
- 3 Q. Do you know how they got in the positions
- that we see them in this photograph? 4
- 5 A. No. I do not.
- 6 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 7 Exhibit 821.
- 8 And if you will just orient the jury. On
- 9 this photograph where would the door be?
- We're directly in the back of the sweat 10
- lodge. So the door would be right here on the 11
- 12 ground.
- 13 **Q.** On the other side?
- Α. On the other side. 14
- Q. What are we looking at right here? 15
- That looks like the two sticks that I 16
- tied the door to. I have another two sticks that 17
- 18 we have ropes tied to, and I throw it over the
- sweat lodge so the door won't fall. 19
- Would those two sticks normally be in the 20 position we see in this photograph? 21
- 22 No. Not very likely. They'd probably be
- hanging about mid level of the sweat lodge or on 23
- the ground. 24
- 25 On this side that we can see in the

1 photograph?

2

3

4

8

21

24

1

2

9

- Α. Yes.
- Q. Where is the door in this photograph?
- The door is on the other side. We're
- looking directly at the back. So this is kind of
- an anchor so the door won't fall while the sweat
- lodge is going on.
 - Q. And if you can draw, where would the
- sticks be hanging?
- 10 Usually they'd be right around here or on Α.
- 11 the ground with some rocks on them.
- 12 Q. And then explain to the jury how those
- 13 two sticks, then, connect to the door.
- 14 A. Two ropes. I wrap them together, put
- rope on each side and it goes to the stick that's 15
- 16 holding the door on.
- 17 **Q.** Do you know what the coverings are that
- 18 are seen in this photograph?
- 19 Those are some of the blankets that we
- 20 used to cover the sweat lodge.
 - Q. Do you know how they got up to the top of
- 22 the sweat lodge?
- 23 Α. No, I don't.
 - Q. I'm going to show you Exhibit 824. Do
- recognize what that is?

- 232
- Α. That's a towel and a hat.
 - I'm going to show you 825. Do you Q.
- 3 recognize what that is?
- 4 Α. Those are the inside, and those are the
- 5 moving blankets.
- 6 Q. With respect to 824, do you have a
- recollection as to whether or not those towels were
- 8 used on October 8th?
 - A. Yes. They were.
- 10 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I move for the
- 11 admission of Exhibit 824.
- 12 MR. LI: No objection.
- 13 THE COURT: 824 is admitted.
 - (Exhibit 824 admitted.)
- 15 BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put 824 on the
- 16 overhead. Do you know when this photograph was
- 17 taken?
- 18 Α. No, I don't.
- 19 Will you show the jury the towel that you Q.
- recognize in this photograph.
- 21 Well, these two towels here look like the Α. towels that we use for sweat lodges.
- 22 23 **Q.** And then in the photograph we see -- what
- 24 does this appear to be to you?
- 25 A flip-flop sandal.

5

8

17

24

1

6

- 1 Do participants wear footwear into the 2 sweat lodges?
- 3 Α. No.
- Q. And then what is this right here?
- Α. That's a rock. 5
- 6 Q. Do you know what kind of rock?
- 7 A. Regular rock. It's not a lava rock, I 8 don't think.
- 9 MS. POLK: Your Honor, counsel has stipulated 10 to the admission of Exhibit 825.
- THE COURT: 825 is admitted. 11
- 12 BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put up
- 13 Exhibit 825, Mr. Mercer, which is the photograph
- taken the next day, October 9, and ask you if you 14
- 15 recognize this photograph?
- Α. Yes, I do. 16
- Q. 17 Tell the jury what that is.
- 18 That's the inside of the sweat lodge, and 19 those are moving blankets.
- 20 Q. Show the jury where the moving blankets
- 21 are.
- 22 Α. Well, the blue ones are here. And this
- particular section has been sewn together so it 23
- wraps around quite a bit. There is some gray ones 24
- 25 up here and up here.

- 234
- 1 **Q.** Are there any tarps that can be seen from
- the inside of the sweat lodge? 2
- 3 No. Not in this picture I don't see.
- MS. POLK: Your Honor, counsel has agreed to 4
- 5 the admission of 826 and 828.
- 6 THE COURT: 826 and 828 are admitted.
- 7 (Exhibits 826 and 828 admitted.)
- 8 BY MS. POLK: I'm going to put up on the
- overhead Exhibit 826, Mr. Mercer, and ask you if 9
- you recognize that? 10
- 11 Α. That looks like the inside of the sweat
- 12 lodge,
- 13 Q. Do you know what part of the sweat lodge
- this is a photograph of? 14
- Α. It would probably be the top, the ceiling 15
- 16 part.
- 17 Q. Do you recognize it would be the sweat
- lodge used in October of 2009? 18
- A. Oh, with that picture I couldn't tell 19
- 20 you.
- 21 **Q.** Can you tell the jury what the material
- is we're looking at in this photograph? 22
- Those are moving blankets and other 23 Α. blankets.
- 24
- 25 Q. Will you point to the moving blankets.

- The blue ones here are the moving
- 2 blankets. And this is, like, a blanket off a bed
- or something. 3
- 4 **Q.** Are there any tarps that you see?
 - Not there I don't. No.
- 6 Would you expect to see tarps on the
- 7 inside of the sweat lodge?
 - Α. No.
- 9 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- Exhibit 828. 10
- 11 Do you recognize that?
- 12 Α. Those are the rocks, the burnt rocks,
- 13 that are inside the sweat lodge.
- 14 Q. I'm going to show you Exhibit 829. Do
- you recognize that photograph?
- 16 I recognize the area. Yes.
 - Q. Do you recognize anybody in that
- photograph? 18
- 19 A. I see my wife, with the hat on, hugging
- somebody. And that's about it. The rest of them
- 21 I'm not sure. It's pretty blurry.
- 22 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I move for the
- 23 admission of Exhibit 829.
 - MR. LI: No objection.
- 25 THE COURT: 829 is admitted.
 - (Exhibit 829 admitted.)
- 2 Q. BY MS. POLK: I'm going to publish 829,
- 3 Mr. Mercer.
- 4 Recognizing that the photograph itself is
- blurry, will you show the jury where your wife is.
 - Α. This is my wife with the hat.
- 7 Q. Do you recognize any of the people down
- 8 here?
- 9 Α. No, I do not.
- 10 Q. You testified about that evening. And
- 11 will you just tell the jury how long you stayed
- 12 down at the scene.
- 13 A. Until probably around 10:00 o'clock, I
- think. 14
- 15 **Q.** And did you ever go up to the dining room
- 16 at Angel Valley?
- Yeah. We went home, and then my wife 17 18 wasn't feeling so well. So I went to the dining
- 19 room to get a paramedic.
- 20 Q. And I'm going to put back up our map,
- 21 which is Exhibit 140. Show the jury, when you say
- 22 you went home, where you went.
- It's glaring right over my house, but 23
- 24 this is -- that's my house, or that's the house I
- was renting.

Page 237 to 240 of 281

60 of 71 sheets

20

21

23

1

244

- Did you ever provide a statement to law 1 2 enforcement with an attorney present?
- 3 Α. No. I mean -- no. No.
- 4 **Q.** I'm going to have a few questions for you about other sweat lodge ceremonies that you 5 6 assisted with at Angel Valley between 2007 7 and 2009.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. 9 Specifically in 2007 for ceremonies not conducted by Mr. Ray, did you ever observe anybody 10 vomit? 11
- 12 Α. No.

8

- 13 Q. Did you ever observe anybody -- let me 14 ask you this: Did you ever have to assist somebody out of a sweat lodge conducted by someone other 15 than Mr. Ray? 16
- A. No. 17
- Did you ever observe anybody unconscious 18 in 2007 for a ceremony not conducted by Mr. Ray? 19
- 20 Α.
- And in 2008, I want to talk about the Q. 21 ceremonies that you assisted not conducted by 22 Mr. Ray. And with respect to those ceremonies, did 23 you ever observe anybody vomiting? 24
- 25 A. Not at all.

1 **Q.** Did you ever observe anybody that you needed to assist or drag out? 2

- 3 Α. No.
- Q. Did you ever observe anybody unconscious? 4
- Α. 5
- 6 Q. Did you ever observe anybody sick?
- Α. 7 No.
- 8 Q. With respect to the additional ceremony that you assisted with in 2009 -- not Mr. Ray's but 9 the other one not conducted by Mr. Ray -- did you
- 10
- ever observe anybody sick? 11
- 12 A. No.
- Q. Did you ever observe anybody vomiting? 13
- Α. 14
- Q. Did you ever need to assist anybody to 15
- come out of that ceremony? 16
- 17 Α.
- Q. Did you ever observe anybody sick in any 18
- 19 way?
- 20 Α. No.
- Q. 21 For the sweat lodge ceremonies conducted 22 in 2007 not conducted by Mr. Ray, what is the
- normal length of the ceremony in terms of rounds? 23
- MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. 24
- Every sweat lodge is different.

1 THE COURT: Counsel, please approach a minute. 2 Ladies and Gentlemen and Mr. Mercer,

please feel free to stand and stretch.

(Sidebar conference.)

5 MR. LI: If I can just pose a standing 6 objection to all these questions along the lines of 7 the extensive conversation this morning. I don't

want to keep objecting in front of a jury.

9 THE COURT: We've got a pending objection I want to deal with. And it had to do with the 10 length of other sweat lodges. 11

12 MR. LI: May I address that issue?

13 THE COURT: That's what I wanted. I'm 14 thinking back. It's not my practice to allow standing objections. If you want to make a more 16 elaborate --

17 Go ahead, Mr. Li. One thing at a time. 18 Let's go ahead and talk about your objections to 19 Ms. Polk's last question.

MR. LI: With respect to the last question, it's implying some sort of standard of care relating to sweat lodge practices. We've had extensive conversations at sidebar about this with various people that have had experience in sweat 25 lodges.

242

This guy is not an expert in sweat.

Lodges. He's not been disclosed as an expert. His

testimony about what normal lengths are implies --

improperly implies some sort of standard of care

5 relating to the practice of sweat lodges. 6 And we would object to that.

7 THE COURT: Ms. Polk, go ahead.

8 MS. POLK: I think it's appropriate for the

jury to know that the nondefendant sweat lodges --

how they're conducted. They know that nobody got 10

- 11 sick in those. And I think it's important,
- 12 actually. I think it's important to a fair
- recitation of the facts. Particularly important to 13
- the defense case for the jury to understand that 14
- these are shorter, that the door is open for longer 15
- periods of time, that fewer rocks are used, and 16
- 17 that's part of the explanation as for why people
- are not getting sick. 18

19 But I do think that a comparison between 20 how Mr. Ray conducts his sweat lodges and how other 21 sweat lodges where people are not getting sick is

22 relevant and directly relevant to the issue of

causation, as we discussed this morning. 23

24 MR. LI: This is where that blurring takes

place, Your Honor. There is no foundation it's

- 1 even the same sweat lodge in any material respect.
- 2 The idea that some other ceremonies that were
- 3 conducted in 2007 in a completely separate sweat
- 4 lodge isn't, even the same sticks, has any
- relevance to what happened in 2009. Just is
- 6 exactly the reason why we objected so strenuously
- 7 this morning. There is just no connection. We
- 8 think this is propensity evidence, Your Honor.
- **9** MS. POLK: Your Honor, it's not propensity
- 10 evidence. And the jury understands that in 2007
- 11 and until October of 2008 the testimony from this
- 12 witness has been extensive that it's a different
- 13 kiva but, basically, the same set of coverings.
- 14 What's important is that even when it's a
- 15 different kiva, even when it is different, it's the
- 16 sweat lodge used by Mr. Ray. People get sick. And
- 17 when not used by Mr. Ray, people are not getting
- 18 sick.

25

- **19** Part of the reason for that explanation
- 20 is how he runs the sweat lodge itself -- how long
- 21 It is, how many rounds, how many rocks. I made it
- 22 clear through this witness's testimony what the
- 23 similarities are, what was the same and what was
- 24 not the same.
 - And I'd also like to finish bringing in
 - the evidence that the common denominator is
- 2 Mr. Ray. It doesn't really matter what the
- 3 structure is. If it's Mr. Ray's event, people get
- 4 sick. If it's a NonMr. Ray event, people do not
- 5 get sick even when it's a different kiva. When
- 6 It's the same kiva, same thing. Same kiva, same
- 7 coverings, later years, it's the same thing. It's
- 8 only Mr. Ray's sweat lodges that people get sick.
- o only Mr. Ray's sweat lodges that people get sick
- **9** And it goes to the issue of causation.
- THE COURT: And that's the only way it can be admitted.
- So, Mr. Li, I know you say, the blurring.
- 13 And I understand. And that's -- if we're talking
- 14 about 404(b) and other acts, this really isn't
- 14 about 404(b) and other acts, this really isn't
- **15** other-act type of situation. Then that's a
- 16 consideration. That's always been an issue.
- MR. LI: There is also the 403 issue relating
- 18 to whether or not the state is implying some kind
- **19** of standard of care relating to sweat lodges.
- 20 We've had extensive bench conferences with other
- 21 witnesses who have had prior sweat lodge
- 22 experience. The Court has sustained objections
- 23 relating to that for precisely this reason.
- 24 The problem with the state's theory is
- 25 they lack foundation to show that the sweat lodges

- are the same. As a consequence, you cannot
- establish the causation issue. It just can't be
- 3 done.
- 4 MS. POLK: Your Honor, the issue is not how
- ${f 5}$ sweat lodges are run or should be run. That's not
- the issue. The issue is the differences. There is
- ' no particular standard out there for running a
- 8 sweat lodge that the state is trying to suggest.
- **9** What we are bringing out through
- 10 testimony, though, is the common denominator is
- 11 with Mr. Ray people get sick. So regardless of how
- 12 the sweat lodge is run, that's the common
- 13 denominator. And that's what I'm bringing out
- 14 through this witness.
- And in 2007 it doesn't really matter the
- 16 kiva or the coverings. The common denominator is
- 17 If it's Mr. Ray, people are getting sick. The
- 18 difference, then, are important on this issue of
- 19 causation. Because that's the explanation for why
- 20 people are getting sick, and that's the issue of
- 21 causation.
- THE COURT: When you phrase it in the terms of
- 23 the common denominator being Mr. Ray, it makes it
- 24 sound like propensity. It has that.
 - MS. POLK: Your Honor, it's not propensity.
 - I It's causation. The defense has suggested that
- 2 there is something else out there -- the tarps or
- 3 the water or the wood. This is something else out
- 4 there.

25

246

- 5 And this is relevant to show that it
- 6 doesn't really matter those conditions. People are
- 7 not getting sick if it's not Mr. Ray's sweat lodge.
- 8 It's not propensity. It's causation.
- 9 THE COURT: There is the other question, too,
- 10 about these difference in conditions. Are you
- 11 talking about a difference in kind or some
- 12 continuum or spectrum? There are those too. There
- 13 may well need to be limiting instructions. But
- 14 talking about mechanical type differences without
- 15 an implication that there is some standard or there
- 16 is some kind of expertise here. Again, it has to
- 17 be observational. And there may well be a limiting
- 18 instruction. But it's going to be permitted.
- On the other thing, Mr. Li, you just have to make your objections.
- 20 to make your objections.21 MR. LI: Your Honor, you've put us in an
- 22 awkward position. We have made a very strong
- 23 objection. And we are contemplating all of our
- 24 various legal options. So we understand the
 - 4 various legal options. So we understand the
- 25 Court's ruling.

Page 245 to 248 of 281

The problem is the Court -- it makes

it -- you're putting us in a position, then, to

object to something you're going to allow in.

THE COURT: If you want an understanding

THE COURT: If you want an understanding that your objections are on these grounds, I will not make you repeat that.

7 MR. LI: Thank you.

5

6

14

15

16

17

8 THE COURT: If you just want to note you
9 object to the question, there was talk -- well,
10 causation testimony that was anticipated possibly
11 depending on foundation. You have questions
12 regarding that and you've done fairly extensive
13 cross-examination, I think 10 minutes or more on.

MR. LI: I understand. And the point is to demonstrate there lacks foundation here for any valid comparison. And our position is that this entire line of questioning is inappropriate, as we discussed this morning.

discussed this morning.
And I'm not waiving any objections that
we made this morning because those objections posed
address all of the issues that the state's getting
into right now.

THE COURT: I wouldn't anticipate there would be many questions along this line. But for what you've said now, if you want to make the objections

250

- based on what you registered here on this benchconference, I'll just acknowledge that. And you
- 3 need to object.
- 4 MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor.
- THE COURT: Ms. Polk, anything further on thispoint?
- 7 MS. POLK: I believe I heard the Court say he 8 needs to object --
- 9 THE COURT: I'm saying he has to object. What
- 10 I'm saying, I don't need a full elaboration of the
- 11 reason each time as long as it's understood what
- 12 was said in this bench conference.
- MS. POLK: I understand. All right.
- 14 THE COURT: But what you said before and you15 registered --
- MR. LI: I just want to make sure that we
- 17 don't waive any objections on any sort of appellate
- 18 basis or anything like that. I understand what the
- 19 Court's ruling is.

questions?

- 20 May I make an objection just initially21 and have it standing for all of the various
- THE COURT: I don't know what the questions are going to be. So no. If you're objecting on
- 25 the grounds of the specific objection now, what you

- 1 stated in this bench conference, that's fine.
- 2 You're saying you've stated other things. That's
- 3 going to be a general matter of record and whether
- 4 this court's made a mistake about how this 404(b)
- 5 or intrinsic evidence, all that came out. So
- 6 that's on the record.

But for now what's understood is yourobjections are what you've stated in this bench

9 conference. If you say that, that's going to be

10 understood.

11

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

25

2

5

8

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

20

Ms. Polk, agreed?

12 MS. POLK: Yes.

13 MR. LI: Thank you.

(End of sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: You may continue when you're ready, Ms. Polk.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Mr. Mercer, I want to ask you specifically about the sweat lodge ceremonies that you had a role in in the year 2007. Are you able to recall -- I want to ask you about sweat lodge ceremonies not conducted by Mr. Ray.

A. Okay.

Q. Do you recall for -- the first one you

24 did was for Mr. Ray?

A. Yes. That's correct.

252

- 1 Q. Do you recall how many rounds that was?
 - A. I -- it goes about eight rounds.
- 3 Q. And then the -- did you do a second
- 4 ceremony in 2007?
 - A. Not for James Ray. But yes.
- **Q.** For somebody else?
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
 - **Q.** And for that second ceremony, do you
- 9 recall how long the rounds were?

A. Not how long. The whole thing lasted about an hour, hour and a half.

Q. And for Mr. Ray's in 2007, do you recallhow long the whole thing lasted?

A. It was over two hours.

Q. With respect to the ceremony in 2007 that you did for someone other than Mr. Ray, do you recall how long the door was open between rounds?

MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

Counsel, you know -- there is a

21 foundation issue. On foundation, sustained.

Q. BY MS. POLK: For the second ceremony that you did in 2007, not for Mr. Ray, do you

24 know -- this is yes or no -- do you know how many

25 rounds were conducted?

Page 253 to 256 of 281

64 of 71 sheets

- over on this side talking about where the two 2 people we pulled out were.
- 3 Do you recognize the group of people over 4 here?
- 5 Α. I don't -- no. I didn't have really any 6 contact with the people in this -- this year's 7 sweat lodge. So I don't really know the faces very 8
- well.
- 9 Q. For the burning ceremony, how long did 10 that last?
- 11 Α. It was a couple hours.
- 12 Q. Was Debbie there also?
- 13 Α. Yes, she was.
- 14 Q. Do you recall how many people were there
- 15 for that?
- 16 Α. Thirty or 40. There was quite a few 17 people around the sweat lodge.
- 18 I'm going to put this back up on the 19 overhead.
- 20 Did you have a role in taking down the
- 21 kıva?
- 22 A. Yes, I did. I assisted the rest of the people when we took it apart. 23
- 24 Q. Tell the jury how you took it apart.
- 25 Α. We had a knife. And there was some
 - 258
- people just untying the strings. And they'd untie 1 2 them and then pull the sticks out of the ground.
- 3 And we made a pile with it.
- 4 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- 5 Exhibit 232. Did you gather around the kiva?
- 6 Α. Yes, we did.
- 7 Q. What were you doing in this photograph,
- 8 if you recall?
- 9 We were having a ceremony to honor the 10 people who were in the sweat lodge and especially 11 the people who died.
- - Was there a leader of that ceremony?
- Α. 13 I guess if there were a leader, it would be Michael Hamilton. 14
- 15 Q. Did you have some role or did you say
- 16 some prayers or anything?
- 17 Yes, I did. I had taken a bowl of corn meal, and I gave everybody some corn meal. And I 18
- said let's say a prayer to the corn meal and offer 19 20 it to the sweat lodge.
- 21 Q. What does the corn meal symbolize for
- 22 you?

- 23 It just symbolizes an offering, something
- 24 to offer. It's an energetic offering pretty much
- that you offer energetically that what happened

- there -- try to help any negative energies or any
- of the souls that might be hanging around, to help
- them move on.
- 4 Q. I'm going to put up on the overhead
- Exhibit 233. Does this illustrate what you talked 5
- 6 about with the untying of the branches?
 - Α. Yes, it is.
 - Q. I'm going to put up Exhibit 235. What do
- you recall about this photograph?
- 10 That's where we piled the sticks and took 11 the remaining rocks and made a heart around it and
- 12 we burned it.

7

8

15

18

24

- 13 **Q.** And then Exhibit 236. Is that the
- 14 burning, then, of the willow branches?
 - Α. Yes, it is.
- 16 Q. How long would you say the willow
- 17 branches were burning for?
 - Half hour. They burned up pretty quick.
- 19 Q. And then Exhibit 237. There is something
- 20 purple we can see in the fire. Do you recall what
- 21 that was?
- 22 Those are called "prayer ties." Α.
- 23 Q. Where did they come from?
 - Α. They were probably on the inside of the
- sweat lodge attached to it, or they could have been
 - 260

- 1 around the door.
- 2 And did your proximity to this fire
- 3 during the burning ceremony make you sick in any
- 4 way?

5

- Α. Not at all.
- 6 You told the jury earlier that for
- 7 Mr. Ray's 2009 sweat lodge ceremony that a hundred
- rocks were ordered. Do you recall that?
- 9 Α. That's correct.
- 10 Q. How many were ordered for Mr. Ray's 2008
- 11 sweat lodge ceremony?
- 12 Α. Approximately 80.
- 13 O. And do you recall how many were ordered
- for Mr. Ray's 2007 ceremony? 14
- 15 Α. Approximately 80 again.
- 16 And do you recall how many rocks were
 - ordered for the other sweat lodges that you did in
- 18 2007 that were not Mr. Ray's events?
- 19 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor.
- 20 THE COURT: That's a yes or no, if you can
- 21 answer it, Mr. Mercer.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Yes.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: Will you tell the jury how
- 24 many.
- 25 MR. LI: Same objection.

17

```
261
 1
         THE COURT: It's -- and the grounds, Mr. Li?
 2
         MR. LI: Those discussed at sidebar, Your
 3
    Honor.
 4
        THE COURT: Overruled.
 5
         THE WITNESS: I know that Singing Bear would
    only have 24. And Kerrie. She had approximately
 6
7
    30. And I know that Healing Wolf would be in the
8
    24, 25 range.
9
         Q. BY MS. POLK: And who was Kerrie? Kerrie
    Dancing Butterfly?
10
11
         A. That's correct.
         Q. Thank you, Mr. Mercer.
12
13
             Thank you, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel.
14
15
              We're going to go ahead and take the
16
    recess.
17
        MR. LI: Your Honor, if I can use 13 minutes?
18
        THE COURT: The -- I just want to make sure
    we -- we have got one question about a juror's had
19
20
    some issues -- you know.
21
        MR. LI: Fair enough.
22
         THE COURT: Health things. I'm concerned
23
    about that. I think we should go ahead and recess,
24
    then, for evening. Let everybody get some rest.
25
              Please, ladies and gentlemen, remember
                                                  262
    all aspects of the admonition. That continues to
1
2
    apply.
```

3 And, Mr. Mercer, recall that rule of 4 exclusion I've discussed with you. You must follow 5 that completely. 6 You understand? 7 We'll be in recess. 8 Well, I'm going to ask the parties to 9 remain. 10 I'll stand as the jury exits. 11 You are excused too, sir. 12 (Proceedings continued outside presence of jury.) 13 14 THE COURT: The record will show the presence 15 of the defendant and the attorneys. The witness is 16 now leaving, and the jury has exited as well. 17 And Mr. Li, two things. I do want to use all the time possible. But I've been watching the 18

MR. LI: I apologize for my eagerness.

said he wanted to raise some legal issues. And

THE COURT: And the other thing was Mr. Kelly

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Judge. And I believe

particular juror and --

we'll do that.

it will be brief.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

263 1 But, essentially, the inquiry is this: 2 We listened to your ruling this morning regarding the admissibility of the prior sweat lodges. I'm not going to call them "prior acts," but the prior sweat lodges. 6 And I have a distinct memory that your 7 instruction to Ms. Polk was that there could be limited inquiry into those prior events in order to establish causation. Because, obviously, still, the issue is what happened in '09. And this is a 11 manslaughter case. 12 Then we heard the direct examination of 13 Mr. Mercer, which, Judge, I believe, went beyond limited inquiry into these prior sweat lodge 15 incidents. 16 But more importantly, Judge, I think the 17 question that we have is this: There have been 18 some 15 witnesses disclosed by the state who have 19 been proffered as witnesses who are going to 20 testify about the prior sweat lodge events 21 beginning in '05 and going through '09. 22 And what we're asking for at this point

And what we're asking for at this point in time, Judge, is a clarification in that regard from the Court. We're not exactly sure where we stand. I believe that's articulated by Mr. Li at

264 the sidebar. And we're asking for a clarification. 1 2 I recall Friday you instructing Ms. Polk that she could not make comparisons between other sweat lodge in terms of duration and et cetera. If I'm mistaken in this regard, I apologize. But I recall that at a sidebar. And now we just heard 6 some comparison. And we simply want to know from the Court the scope of the ruling, if possible, 9 Judge. 10 THE COURT: With Fawn Foster, the way the 11 questioning was presented was just coming out as 12

questioning was presented was just coming out as showing her to be some type of expert or something or being able to make these comparisons. She also had difficulty in saying when the sweat lodge actually occurred. There was just a number of issues that came up really with her first. And the objections were made. They were sustained at the time.

But before I address the other part, Ms. Polk, I want to hear what you have to say about this, the points that Mr. Kelly has raised.

MS. POLK: Well, Your Honor, the discussion that we had this morning outside the presence of the jury clearly included that whole pattern what happens when it's a Mr. Ray run sweat lodge, what

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 happens when it is not.

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

I agree with the Court. With respect to Fawn Foster, the state had never intended to elicit comparisons. The area we were talking about with Fawn Foster was her role, her participation, in a sweat lodge not run by Mr. Ray and then asking her to describe that.

The Court indicated at the time that when the proper foundation had been laid, that you would consider allowing us to ask those questions.

We, then, did not go there and indicated that when that proper foundation had been laid, then it was our intention to call her back to talk specifically about a ceremony she participated on at Angel Valley using that same kiva, the same coverings, and to describe what that ceremony was like. And so, yes, that was a comparison.

The Court indicated at the time it would be admissible once the proper foundation was laid that it was the same kiva and the same coverings. The foundation had not been laid at that point.

It has now been laid or it will be laid, continue to be laid through the Hamiltons, and then we intend to be bringing Ms. Foster back.

THE COURT: Mr. Kelly, that was the primary

266

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

concern there is just the foundation, and even when

2 it occurred what the materials were. Ms. Foster

3 kept indicating they were kept in the pump room but

4 not knowing various things about them. Then Mr. Li

5 In his voir dire actually did some fairly extensive

6 cross-examination about potential foundational

7 issues.

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

25

But anyway, go ahead.

MR. KELLY: Judge, I'm not arguing the point. I believe Mr. Li argued very well this morning in regards to our objections.

THE COURT: Let me get to part two, then.

13 The other part --

And, Ms. Polk, I don't know that you addressed this. But it had to do with 15 disclosed witnesses and what's going to happen now. And I've said this testimony really should be relatively brief. It goes to the issue of physical causation, and it just doesn't need to be and won't be

and it just doesn't need to be and won't be
cumulative. That's my thought.
Ms. Polk, you didn't address that. I

don't know if you had anything else to say on that. But I want to hear. That's actually what I wanted

24 you to address.

Mr. Hughes, you're going to do that?

1 MR. HUGHES: Yes, Your Honor. With the

2 Court's permission, I'll address that topic.

We do expect the other witnesses who werenot participants in '09 to be relatively brief

5 witnesses. We've been moving really slowly through

6 the '09 witnesses to this point.

Witnesses who were at prior years' sweat
lodges, I expect we'll move through them much more
quickly. And I agree that there is a point where
evidence does become cumulative. We don't intend
to cross that point.

But the -- to compare the witnesses that
we've had so far to the witnesses who will talk
about prior events, it's sort of like comparing
apples to oranges. I do believe we'll move through
them much more quickly than we've been moving
through the witnesses at this point.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm concerned about cumulative because it then does carry the potential of it's not just about causation and that really heat is what's going on, which is what you're maintaining, as opposed to something else, and here's the circumstantial evidence of that.

It'll get to the point of a number of people getting up there and perhaps going well

268

1 beyond strict observations, which the 404(b)

hearing revealed will not have anything that

3 suggests in itself that life-threatening conditions

4 were involved.

MR. KELLY: Judge, again, I heard Ms. Polk at the sidebar. I just heard her articulate a pattern to me, and then your response, Judge. And to me, it implies that the 404(b) floodgate is open, in other words. And then Mr. Hughes said, yes, we're going to call all 15.

Now, we're entitled to notice to prepare our defense. We're eight weeks into trial, and Mr. Li argued this morning. We don't believe it's proper. And all we're asking is some definitive response from the Court as to what is going to be admitted so we can prepare our defense and make legal decisions in this case.

And I think I heard Mr. Hughes say that the state intends on presenting each and every one of the 15 witnesses disclosed as 404(b) prior act evidence witnesses, and now under the myth of causation, they're going to be allowed into this trial.

And if that's true, Judge, we're entitled to notice so we can prepare properly. And we're

also entitled to amend our witness list so that we can present evidence contrary to those witness 2 representations as to the prior incidents. That's 4 all we're trying to clarify, Judge.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

determination.

And I'm still unsure as to what the state intends. I mean, 15 brief witnesses versus 15 lengthy witnesses. That still requires us to prepare.

We're asking for notice, and then we may ask for the opportunity to amend our trial witness list, which is going to lengthen this trial.

12 The jury can't get just one side of this. 13 We've been through this in November.

I think of the famous two photographs. I don't recall their numbers. But one perspective, the witness said, oh, look what distress they're in. And we showed the other perspective. They had the thumbs up and a big smile on their face. We need to combat or show the other side of the story if the state's going to present 15 witnesses from these prior incidents.

THE COURT: Mr. Hughes.

23 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, if I can address a 24 couple points. First of all, I realize it's 4:30. 25

And I'm not going to say -- go too far into the

state takes exception to the "myth of causation."

2 Causation is a very real issue that's arisen in this case, and it's appropriate for the 3 state to address it. 4

With respect to 15, the Court today made clear it's decision that we're to go into that area but only briefly. So we do have to make decisions as to which of the 15 we'll be calling.

It does raise the issue, however, if we only call 5 or 6 of those 15, will the defense then make a comment to the jury in its closing argument, you only heard from 5 or 6 witnesses. You didn't hear from all the others.

And so, I don't want -- if the defense is raising these spectre of cumulative at this point, I don't want that to be raised as an argument later on.

But as to which of these 15 or so 18 witnesses we intend to call, we will make a 19 20 decision, as I told the Court a few minutes ago. 21 It's not our intention to spend a long time with 22 every one of these witnesses. We intend to move much more quickly with the witnesses. And at this 23 point we may not all 15. We just need to make that 24

1 THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to permit 2 cumulative testimony on this.

3 MR. KELLY: Judge, I have to correct one thing 4 for the record.

5 Causation is not a myth. It's a 6 necessary element that the state has to prove 7 beyond a reasonable doubt.

8 The myth is that at one time during a 404(b) hearing, the causation was the propensity of 10 Mr. Ray and the fact that he stood through these 11 various prior events and did nothing.

12 When that was rejected by the Court, the 13 causation argument became Rick Ross and Steven Pace and the EL-GAT (phonetic) theory. And now eight 15 weeks into trial, the myth of the causation in the state's argument is the back door to the 404(b). That's what I was referring to in regards to a 17 18 myth.

And again, Judge, you said this morning limited inquiry. And 15 witnesses, I would submit, is not limited inquiry. It requires preparation of 15 witnesses. And it requires us, contrary to what Mr. Hughes says, to argue to this jury that the handpicked 15 witnesses out of four years of sweat lodge ceremonies involving several hundreds of

270

19

20

21

22

24

25

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

people is not an accurate, factual representation of what happened. That's the position.

3 And I think you said it best in November. We're not going to back and go through a series of 5 minitrials beginning in '05. And yet that's the 6 position that we're in.

And all we're asking for this afternoon, in order to properly assess our alternatives -- and we talked about this this morning -- is clear direction from the Court as to what's going to be allowed.

And I think the response from the state at one time is that 15 are necessary. And after listening to my argument, all of a sudden they'll pare it down and give us notice at a later date. That's inadequate, Judge.

17 THE COURT: There is not going to be 18 cumulative testimony. There has been testimony to 19 the effect of what was contemplated. It's not 20 going to be cumulative. And I suppose, Mr. Kelly, 21 it depends on what's the defense does. Even as a 22 result of what's been produced here today, that 23 might dictate other witnesses.

24 But that's what I'm saying. It's not going to be cumulative, and it's not going to be

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

274

1 testimony that really is suggesting some kind of 2 propensity. It's not going to be that. As I've indicated here in open court and also at these bench conferences, there may well need to be a limiting instruction.

Mr. Hughes, it's just not going to be cumulative testimony. That's all I can say.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor. The state understands that.

MR. KELLY: Judge, we're entitled to a list of names of the people that they intend to present as to those prior years. We're entitled to know which of the 2009 participants that were involved in earlier years will testify in that regard.

THE COURT: You're saying they haven't been disclosed?

MR. KELLY: What I'm saying, Judge, is everything has been disclosed. And now we're hearing a comment from the state it will not be cumulative.

And what I'm asking are more questions than arguments. I realize there are arguments interwoven in it. So what does that mean? Which ones are you going to call? Which ones are you not? What type of evidence from the 2009

participants who may have been involved in earlier sweat lodge events are going to discuss the prior sweat lodges? We're entitled to that notice.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, the state does believe it has met its discovery obligations. We've provided the defense with the notice of witnesses that we had intended to call. That list of witnesses is significantly shorter than all the people who are involved in this case. It's not an anything and everything in the list.

As I indicated, we amongst the prosecution team will be talking to see if we can pare the list down further. But as of now the state has disclosed and the defense does have the state's list of witnesses for the different years.

Remember, we are talking about four years, Mr. Kelly. And I don't know if the 15 number, quite honestly, is accurate. Although it's certainly in the ballpark. That will be approximately four a year. And we may be able to carve that down further.

22 Individual witnesses remember different 23 things about particular years. And that needs to 24 be factored in as well when you're determining at what point does a witness's testimony become

1 cumulative from what they've heard from other 2 witnesses.

3 But the state understands the Court's ruling. The cumulative rule applies in every case 4 with every bit of evidence, and we're aware that it applies in this case as well.

7 We didn't call every participant 8 from 2009. We have not disclosed as trial 9 witnesses every participant from '09 or from '08 or 10 from the other years. We pared that list down, and 11 we may continue to pare the list down.

But for Mr. Kelly to ask at 4:30 who do we intend to call at this point, I think it's unfair. The state needs time to decide. And the Court needs to hear from the testimony of those particular witnesses if Mr. Kelly believes that they're cumulative for the Court to make a ruling.

It's premature at this point, before we've heard from those other witnesses, to determine at what point do they become cumulative.

Clearly witnesses remember different aspects of the same year that they were in attendance at. And as long as you're not calling three or four witnesses to say the same thing, it's not going to reach the point of being cumulative.

276

MR. KELLY: Judge, again, we're assessing our legal options. And we're really unclear as to where we stand in regards to the Court's ruling.

We clearly understand the nature of the cumulative testimony or evidence and know when to object in that regard. But that's not the issue.

What has happened today, as articulated by Mr. Li this morning, is a gate has opened that we did not anticipate. We relied on your pretrial court order. We relied on your rulings up to that point. We understand your rationale now.

But we would like something clear, articulated, so that we can assess whether or not we need to request a stay of special action to the Arizona Appellate Court. And we don't have that at this point in time. We're still not sure.

Even in Mr. Hughes' response, he says, we have notice of the 15, and we may call them. That still is inadequate. Which ones is he going to call?

THE COURT: If you recall Jennifer Haley's testimony, and I think that was actually made without objection in court. There was a brief mention -- well, brief testimony regarding an incident. There was a statement about an opinion,

going to the hospital, that came out or maybe should have gone to the hospital.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

Then there was a photograph offered that had been listed in the morning and then delisted.

And then we had that whole, full discussion about impeaching and whether that photographed had to be disclosed, and I sustained the objection there.

So this was not the first time that testimony of lay observation of an effect of the sweat lodge has been introduced in the trial.

It was Jennifer Haley, wasn't it?

MR. LI: It was, Your Honor. But it was objected to, just for the record.

THE COURT: Well, there were objections there. I know there were. And I know that I'm just trying to think with regard to that specific aspect whether or not there was an objection. But -- so this isn't the first time it's come in.

I've indicated there is no reason to dwell on this type of testimony. It's brought up with regard to physical causation. That's, I think, how Ms. Polk confirmed this morning that that's the reason it's being offered, not the legal aspect of causation that you've also talked about as well. And the limiting instruction is a

1 Because without that clarity, we are in

this situation where we are trying to determine the

road rules at sidebar. And it makes things

4 difficult, as the Court saw this afternoon. It

just makes things difficult because we don't know

what the rules of the road are going to be.

7 And so the question here is simply,

8 setting aside the cumulative issue, is it the

9 Court's ruling that -- you know -- prior witnesses

10 relating to prior sweat lodges can come in and

11 testify about -- and let's assume for a second

12 those same witnesses did not participate in

13 the 2009 case, so they have literally no basis of

14 comparison to anything. All they're going to do is

describe what happened in 2005, let's say, for

16 instance.

Is it the Court's ruling that those
witnesses who would only, say, describe 2005, that
that would be admissible for the various reasons
for causation purposes? Is that --

THE COURT: What's admissible are limitedobservation as to effects which the experts have

23 tied into heat perhaps, or arguably. That's what

24 they can testify to. And with regard to have

25 comparisons of number of rocks and others, I can't

278

distinct possibility.

When you look at the total time the testimony has taken for Ms. Haley in this area and then for Mr. Mercer, it was not very much.

And in terms of numbers, I don't see the need for a multitude of witnesses on this,
Mr. Hughes. That's all I'm saying. The point can be made with focused, clear observations that relate to just observations and not opinion.

Mr. Lı.

MR. LI: Sorry, Your Honor. The issue is this: I beg to differ when the Court says it's only relating to physical causation. Because the state is not talking about physical causation. They're talking about --

THE COURT: Mr. Li, I don't want to interrupt you, but you've made that argument so many times today and elaborately. And I've talked about if there needs to be some kind of limiting instruction, that can happen.

MR. LI: I appreciate that, Your Honor. I guess what we're really looking for is a definitive ruling on this issue so that we can pose -- decide whether a special action is appropriate and decide what issue would be presented on special action.

imagine anybody getting into that aspect of it.

2 But physical causation and the testimony will not

3 be cumulative. That's the guidance I can provide

4 you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. LI: Thank you. Just so we're clear, if there is a hypothetical witness who only testifies relating to 2005, what he or she observed in 2005, did not participate in 2009, that witness would be admissible for the various purposes that the state claims are appropriate?

THE COURT: Well, at this time, that's all I'm going to say. All the guidance I can give is there will not be cumulative testimony in this area.

That's all I can say, Mr. Lı.
Thank you. We're in recess.
(The proceedings concluded.)

```
STATE OF ARIZONA
                           ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
    COUNTY OF YAVAPAI )
              I, Mina G Hunt, do hereby certify that I
    am a Certified Reporter within the State of Arizona
    and Certified Shorthand Reporter in California
              I further certify that these proceedings
    were taken in shorthand by me at the time and place
    herein set forth, and were thereafter reduced to
    typewritten form, and that the foregoing
10
    constitutes a true and correct transcript
              I further certify that I am not related
12
    to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the
    parties or attorneys herein, nor otherwise
14
    interested in the result of the within action
15
              In witness whereof, I have affixed my
16
    signature this 17th day of April, 2011.
17
19
20
21
22
23
                MINA G HUNT, AZ CR No. 50619
CA CSR No. 8335
24
25
```

1	STATE OF ARIZONA)
2) ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI)
3	
4	I, Mina G. Hunt, do hereby certify that I
5	am a Certified Reporter within the State of Arizona
6	and Certified Shorthand Reporter in California.
7	I further certify that these proceedings
8	were taken in shorthand by me at the time and place
9	herein set forth, and were thereafter reduced to
10	typewritten form, and that the foregoing
11	constitutes a true and correct transcript.
12	I further certify that I am not related
13	to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the
L4	parties or attorneys herein, nor otherwise
L5	interested in the result of the within action.
L 6	In witness whereof, I have affixed my
L7	signature this 17th day of April, 2011.
L8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	11, 1
23	MINA G. HUNT, AZ CR NO. 50619
24	CA CSR No. 8335
25	